THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND LIFE SET FORTH FROM THE SCRIPTURES BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

69-G

VOL. XXVIII, No. 4 OCTOBER, 1921

The Lord Working in the World
WILLIAM L. WORCESTER 369

Christian Freedom
EVERETT K. BRAY 379

Come to Jesus
EDMOND CONGER BROWN 387

The Children and the Church
ALICE ARCHER SEWALL JAMES 406

The Decoration of a Church of the New Jerusalem
E. DONALD ROBB 421

"Purpose and Transcendentalism" [a review of the book by H. Stanley Redgrove] LEWIS F. HITE 432

(For Editorial Department, see next page.)

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

Editorials :

The Convention of 1921. WILLIAM F. WUNSCH - - - - 454
The Urbana University Endowment. LEWIS F. HITE - - - 462
Revue De L'ere Nouvelle. THE EDITORS - - - - - 471

Biblical and Doctrinal Studies :

The Outcome of the Glorification of the Lord.
HENRY F. REYNOLDS - - - - - - - 472
The Apostolic Succession and the Lambeth Conference.
JOHN WHITEHEAD - - - - - - - - 479

Current Literature :

Charles Byse's "Apocalypse". WILLIAM F. WUNSCH - - - 485
R. R. Rodgers' "Story of My Life." WM. MCGEORGE, JR. - - 488
A. L. Kip's "Prophecies of Daniel." FRANK W. VERY - - - 492
Samuel A. B. Mercer's "Life and Growth of Israel."
RUSSELL EATON - - - - - - - - 494

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

EDITORS.—Rev. Lewis F. Hite, *Managing Editor*, and Messrs. B. A. Whittemore and Kenneth P. Kempton. *Advisory Committee*,—Rev. Messrs. H. Clinton Hay and Wm. F. Wunsch.

Published by THE MASS. NEW-CHURCH UNION
134 BOWDOIN STREET, BOSTON
50 CENTS A COPY ALBERT P. CARTER, Treas. $2.00 A YEAR
(Postage to Canada 12 Cents, and to Europe 20 Cents Extra, Per Annum.)
Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter

THEOLOGICAL WORKS OF EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

STANDARD EDITION, $1.00 per volume, postpaid
LIBRARY EDITION, $1.50 per volume, postpaid
UNIFORM EDITION, (paper), 16 mo., 30c per volume, postpaid
Also LATIN and LATIN-ENGLISH EDITIONS.
Send for catalogue containing complete lists.

FOR MISSIONARY PURPOSES

we supply the UNIFORM EDITION books at 25 cents per copy, postpaid. LEAFLETS for distribution, singly or in quantity, with excellent portrait of SWEDENBORG and short sketch of his life, offering these four books at 25c each, sent GRATIS

THE AMERICAN SWEDENBORG PRINTING AND PUBLISHING SOCIETY

3 West 29th Street **New York, N. Y.**

THE

NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XXVIII.] OCTOBER, 1921 [No. 4

THE LORD WORKING IN THE WORLD

By the REV. WILLIAM L. WORCESTER

IF we are to believe the declarations and promises of the Lord Jesus Christ spoken while He walked with men, He still lives; He still is present and working and ruling in the world that He came to save. He said:

I will not leave you comfortless, I will come to you. . . . Ye now, therefore, have sorrow; but I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you.

Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.

After His resurrection, He sent forth His disciples with the assurance,

All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. . . . Lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.

Indeed, the Lord's words indicate that He is present with a fuller power than when He walked with men.

I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall take of mine and shall show it unto you. . . . Verily, verily, I say unto you He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father.

The Book of Acts gives us the witness of the disciples and the early followers of the Lord; to them the presence of the Lord working with them was the most real of all realities. In strength from Him those simple, untaught men faced the world; they knew no fear.

And to these declarations of the Lord, and this witness of disciples, is added the Lord's revealing of Himself to John in Patmos, in a dark hour of persecution for the Church, with assurance from His own mouth and the mouths of angels, that He lives and reigns in earth and heaven. "I am he that liveth, and was dead, and behold, I am alive forever more. Amen: and have the keys of hell and of death." He spoke then the tender promise, "Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me." A great voice from heaven declared that His tabernacle is with men, to dwell with them, to wipe away all tears. The burden of the Book of Revelation is that the Lord Jesus Christ lives and reigns; that He still is present and working in earth and heaven, carrying forward His saving work to full fruition.

If this is indeed true, we ought to know it; we ought to build upon it and make it part of all our plans. Our purpose in life should be to cooperate with Him. We ought to read and study the Gospel not only to learn of the life lived long ago. It is indeed the precious history of a Divine work of victory over evil and of establishing the Divine presence in its fulness upon earth, which are fundamental to all present and future developments of the Divine saving work; but do not read it as a history only, but as the interpretation of the Divine presence today, working with increased effectiveness in the world.

Let us follow this thought a little further, choosing two among many possible lines; one a peaceful line, in which it may be easy to see the present working of the Lord—the Lord's care for children: the other a less peaceful one, in which we may see less of accomplishment, but in which it is the more necessary to know for what the Lord is working,

that we may work with Him and not against Him—the Lord's relation to the world's work.

Among the scenes of the Gospel which reveal most tenderly the heart of Jesus Christ are those which show us the Lord with little children, when He rebuked those who kept little children from Him, took them up in His arms, and blessed them; when He called a little child and set him in the midst, to show and teach who is greatest in the kingdom of heaven. And again when he said:

> Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones, for I say unto you, that their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven. . . . Even so, it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish.

And we cannot forget—Christmas every year reminds us —that Jesus came as a little child, and lived and grew as a child, increasing in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man. The great love which brought Him into the world to gain victories and to lift the burdens for men, included love for little children which could not be satisfied except by living Himself a child, that forever, He might be near to children, with fullness of sympathy and power to bless.

The scenes and words of the Gospel are precious scenes and words of long ago; but they are more; they interpret the Lord's love for children as He is with us in living presence today; the strong arms of His love are today and always about the little children to protect them, working always to lift them up and bless them.

Do we not recognize the Lord's nearness, in the sphere of innocence and protection attending every little child? Was this partly His meaning when He declared: "Whoso shall receive one such little child in my name, receiveth me"? There are with every child from inheritance tendencies to evil which some day will show themselves, but some power holds them back from the infant and the little child; many evil things may be about the little child, but he is blind to them. Some power glorifies for him the

simplest possessions and makes him happy with them. Some power lightens his sufferings and gives the little child a patience at which older persons marvel. If we say it is the presence of angels which gives this innocence and protection to the children, it still is from Jesus, the Divine Friend of children. This influence of heaven is an arm which He extends, strong with His own power to protect and bless them.

Some power attending little children touches the hearts of even hardened men and women of this world to serve them in their helplessness. What will a mother not endure to protect or save her child? What work is too much, what sacrifice too great, for parents, for their children's sake? There is on earth no check to wickedness so powerful as the influence of a little child, no appeal to the slumbering spark of pity and kindness, so strong as the appeal of a little child. The ancient Scripture is still true, which says, "A little child shall lead them." It is the Lord's power with the children that touches the hearts of men and women of this world and makes them the children's servants. It is Jesus the children's Friend who does it. The care of parents and of others in this world is an arm which He provides and makes strong from His own love to support and bless the children.

And taking a broader view of the work of Jesus Christ and of His continued and more effective work as He stands with us in His Divine and glorious presence, is there anything in the world's progress since the coming of the Lord, more striking than the awakening of sympathy with childhood and the discovery of wise ways of helping children? We cannot be blind to the fact of some great power working in the world in the interests of children, working with wonderful effectiveness, especially in the last hundred and fifty years, inspiring a truer sympathy with children, a better understanding of them; bringing forth new methods of education, new books for their instruction and entertainment; new and more humane ways of caring for them in sickness and of protecting them from disease; new and

wonderful methods of caring for defective children and of helping them to overcome their handicaps and to take their place in the work and the pleasure of the world; new ways of dealing with erring children, not treating them as hardened criminals but as prospective citizens and angels, needing wise and friendly guidance.

The great movements for the welfare of children, for infant saving, for the restriction and regulation of child labor, for the education of children, for their normal and happy development, are from a great loving power working in the world. It is no other than the great love of Jesus Christ, still present in the world, and working, according to His promise, in more effective ways; turning the hearts of the fathers to their children and the hearts of the children to their fathers; it is Jesus taking up the children in His mighty arms of love, putting His hands on them in blessing.

Have we here a fulfilment of the Lord's promise of "greater works than these"? It may be said that the works of the Lord's love are greater as men are able to receive and appreciate spiritual benefits, while at first they received chiefly natural ones; but speaking only of natural benefits, are not the works of the Lord's love in guiding men to discover means of healing, and still more in guiding them to discover means of preventing disease, far greater than the miracles of healing wrought by His hands? Yet those miracles must stand for all time to teach us to recognize the power by which all healing work is done. And are not the works of the Lord's love for children through the awakening of human sympathy, through enlightening the minds of men and women to understand children and to care in wise ways for their physical and spiritual development, far greater than were wrought by taking the children in His arms and laying His hands upon them? Yet, that tender act of blessing stands for all time to show the source of the great love moving the world, with increasing effectiveness to uplift and bless the children.

What encouragement to us in our work for children, to

recognize the Lord's hand working for them, and to feel that we are but helpers in His work. And we must by instruction and example help the children to know that the Lord Jesus Christ who is made so real to them in the Gospels, is their nearest and most constant friend. Can we do less, in obedience to His earnest charge, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not"?

Turn now to our other application of our subject, the Lord's presence and hand in the world's work. Let the Lord's life on earth, as the Gospels bring it to us, show us His estimate of work; His attitude toward work; we need this, to interpret the Lord's relation to the world's work today.

First, there is the lesson of His example. From childhood to thirty years of age, for the largest part of His life on earth, the Lord lived in the seclusion of Nazareth, known by the village people as "the carpenter's son," and as "the carpenter"—a maker of the woodwork of their simple homes. There is a peculiar interest in visiting Nazareth, hidden among the hills of Galilee, meeting the villagers at the fountain, climbing the narrow streets on the hillside, passing the doors of humble homes, and the shops of potters, carpenters and other working people. Here the Lord lived and worked for nearly thirty years. By His life and toil in Nazareth, how He glorified small opportunities; how He glorified the workshop and work with the hands, as day by day and year by year He made it the means of bringing down the love of heaven, the very Divine love, and of building it into human life!

And when the Lord left the secluded village and began His public ministry, His days were filled full with works of mercy and with teaching. He went about doing good, was Peter's description of His life; and the Gospel tells of days when the Lord and those with Him had no leisure so much as to eat. When condemned for works done on the Sabbath day, the Lord answered, "My Father worketh hitherto and I work." He said He had meat to eat which the disciples knew not of, and added, "My meat is to do the

will of him that sent me, and to finish his work." And the Lord gave the disciples part in His work: He sent them as laborers into His vineyard, laborers into His harvest. He told them that in good works their light must shine. The Book of Revelation which draws aside the veil of the heavenly world declares that all men are judged by their works; and also that work, freed from the friction and the anxiety which make it hard, has place in the life of heaven. "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, saith the spirit, that they may rest from their labors, and their works do follow them."

The Lord's life and His words testify that work in His sight is good, given to be the means of present and eternal blessing; it is not a curse, something to be avoided as far as possible, but an opportunity and a privilege to be welcomed and joyfully used; it is not a misfortune of this earthly life, but is that in earthly life which especially relates it to heavenly life and to the Divine life.

The Christian philosophy of work is simple. We do not originate life and power; we receive them from the only source of life, and we receive as we give forth again.

> Give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down and shaken together, and running over shall men give into your bosom. For with the same measure that ye mete withal it shall be measured to you again.

It is in accordance with this law that every faculty of body and of mind is developed and grows with exercise, and the unused faculty withers and dies. In a word, use is the channel by which life and power flow from the Lord. In use and by use Divine gifts are ours, and we grow to the measure of men and angels. Another illustration of this law is found in the fact, often recognized, that the task or the office makes the man. How do we account for it, except by the fact that influx of ability from the Lord is into the use, and the man gains strength and wisdom from the Lord in the doing of the use?

It is true in a deeper sense than is often given to the words, that men must work to live. And we may add, that

while there is work of many kinds—work with the hands and work with the mind—if we desire an all-round development, to be fully and completely men, we cannot afford to let go of physical labor, but must be workers with our hands.

But for the full and perfect operation of this law of life, through use, through work, it is essential that we shall work not from selfish motives, not primarily for profit to ourselves, but from the love of serving others, from the love of being useful. The Lord recognized the need for just pay for work, saying, "The workman is worthy of his meat"; "the laborer is worthy of his hire." But these returns for labor are not the chief object and motive of the labor, that on which we ought to set our hearts. Sinners do good to those who do good to them; sinners lend to sinners to receive as much again. But the true spirit of work is shown in the charge,

> Do good and lend hoping for nothing again; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Highest for he is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil. . . . He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.

It is only by working in this unselfish spirit that the channels are open wide for the inflow of power from the Lord, and for the satisfaction and joy in usefulness which are from Him.

This is not mere theory. We know from experience that love lifts the burden and removes the irksomeness of labor. What work is irksome done for those we love? Work is easy when our whole heart is in it. So Jacob found it when seven years' service seemed to him but a few days for the love that he had for Rachel. The Lord knew in Himself the joy, the satisfaction of unselfish service. "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work." He would have men get from Him this unselfish love of service; it will make strong their hands; it is the one thing needful to take the care and trouble out of labor and to make it a joy. In a truer sense, was it of this

satisfaction that He spoke when He said, "The workman is worthy of his meat"; "the laborer is worthy of his hire"?

Such was our Lord's estimate of work when He lived with men on earth, such is His estimate of work as He is present and ruling in the world today. He would not now, as He would not then, take away the necessity for work. He knows that now as then it can be the channel by which strength and blessing from Him may flow into human lives, and that work to serve this use in full measure must be done not selfishly, but from unselfish love of serving others.

There are great changes in the conditions of work since the Lord walked on earth with men, which we believe together with other changes which are making the earth new, are effects of His fuller presence, His more powerful influence. One of these changes is that work has been elevated to a higher position in the world's regard. It would doubtless have been better if work could have won this regard wholly in recognition of its nobility and worth; but it may be for the final good that it has risen in regard, even though it be in part the result of its own self-seeking.

The Lord in other ways has changed the conditions of labor. He has breathed into the minds of men the spirit of discovery and invention, which have put into our hands new tools and new motive powers, increasing a thousand fold the efficiency of man's effort. Compare the small result of a day's labor done by hand with the result when the hand controls a complicated machine, or presses a button and cranes and retorts are moved by electric power. The effectiveness of labor is enormously increased—the power for good or harm. According to the motive which controls the great engines, they are engines of service or destruction. When the hand of man has been made so powerful, a stronger spiritual power is needed to control it, to guide it and to use it for beneficent ends. To me the fact that the Lord, by discovery and invention, has given man's hand such power, is proof that the time has come when the spiritual power to control it and use it well, is also possible.

When this victory of Christian love is realized it will be a marvelous fulfilment of the promise, "Greater works than these . . . because I go unto my Father."

And in another way the Lord has still more increased the importance and the power of labor, by teaching workers to unite to act as one. We tremble to think of the greatness of the power thus developed should it be exercised for selfish and evil ends. But the power of union and combination is capable of being exercised for good. Here again the fact that the Lord has allowed men to discover this great source of power is proof that the time has come when we are capable of a motive which shall use it well. Another fulfilment of the promise of "greater works than these."

The challenge is tremendous to those who know the spirit which should control and guide the hand of labor, to declare it boldly; to make every effort to work from this spirit themselves, and to lead others to work from it. It is the spirit of unselfish service, which the Lord Jesus Christ brought down to earth in the carpenter's shop in Nazareth, and in His life of doing good. It is the only spirit which can lift the burden of toil, and take away its irksomeness; which can make the hand of labor, grown so powerful in these days, not a menace, but the chief guaranty of the world's happiness and peace.

As we believe in Jesus Christ still present and working in the world, we can cease questioning whether his spirit of work is workable; we can accept it and courageously and persistently give all our effort to learning and making application of that spirit in our complex modern life. We can do this confidently, knowing that we are not working alone, nor in a doubtful cause, but are taking part with Him who goes forth conquering and to conquer; who will not fail nor be discouraged till He has set judgment in the earth. Truly, the Lord Jesus Christ is present and working in the world today. Where two or three are gathered together in His name for worship or for work, He is in the midst of them.

WILLIAM L. WORCESTER.

CHRISTIAN FREEDOM

By the Rev. Everett K. Bray

OUR LORD said: "If the Son therefore shall make you free ye shall be free indeed" (John 8:36). He was speaking these words to the Jews, and specifically, it is pointed out, "to those Jews who believed on Him," because of words He had spoken to them just before. If they will "continue in His words," He admonishes them, they will be His disciples truly, and will be "free"; they will then "know the truth," and "the truth will make them free."

"Free? Free?" they say. "We have been always free. We are descended from Abraham. God promised him dominion over every people and nation. We inherit that dominion; and how can you speak as if we were not free?"

His answer is one they had not expected. They are Abraham's seed, it is true. But they are not his heirs. Their own acts have disinherited them, so that they have ceased to be "sons" of that inheritance; they have put themselves in the category of "servants," not hired servants, but *bond* servants, slaves!

Now, not only do slaves lose their inheritance, according to the Biblical law (it is the loss of it and debt beyond it that makes them become slaves), but they have only a temporary abode in "the house" of the free man whom they serve; for if a slave be a Hebrew, as in the case in question, in the Sabbatical year he must be set free to begin life over again. Such limited authority as he has in that house is but temporary. "The servant abideth not in the house for ever." On the other hand, the true heir to the Abrahamic blessings, who never drops to become a slave, does abide "in the house" forever: "the Son abideth ever." And only He Who remains Himself free, can dispense freedom

to those who have made themselves not free. "If the Son therefore shall make you free ye shall be free indeed."

The emphasis here is so strong, that the word the Lord uses for "indeed," is a word that has its ground in the idea of existence, of being; and thus unlike the word "indeed" occurring a few verses before this, and which means "in truth" or "truly"; this "indeed" means "in fact," "in being," "to the life," thus, free through and through! By these steps our Lord develops a line of argument the purpose of which is, to make them conscious of a need they had not been conscious of before; for the sense of need is the first essential, before help can be given.

From the question of descent with respect to Abraham, the Lord leads the thought until it passes on beyond Abraham to God. Not able to substantiate before Him their claim to rights through Abraham, they venture a claim far greater, but which seems to them beyond contradiction. "We have one Father, God." But this opens the way for the Lord to point out to them that the same argument which showed the forfeit of their rights through Abraham also showed the forfeit of their rights as "sons" of God. "Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin," a slave, He points out. Therefore the law of bondservants applies to him; and so the mere slave's authority that he has is but temporary.

On the other hand, "the Son" remains in the house forever, because He is sinless. "Which of you convinceth Me of sin?" He asks. Hence it is conclusive that He alone is free, He alone Master in the "house of God." "There is none good but . . . God"; and He, Jesus, was good. He leads them up to the vision: He was God, come forth in human form, which Form He called "the Son." "Before Abraham was, I AM." "If God were your father," He urges, "ye would love Me: for I proceeded forth and came from God . . . He sent Me." "No man cometh unto the Father but through Me." "If ye had known Me, ye should have known My Father also." "Ye are from beneath; I am from above." "If the Son therefore shall make you

free, ye shall be free indeed." For, is it not written in another place that, "as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God . . . which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God"? Yes, and through Him we who are bondservants all, can be born again, can be "born from above," reborn "of God," and become once more true heirs of the Kingdom. "For as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." Nevertheless, "except a man be born from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God."

So our Lord lifts the question of "freedom" from the level of civil and domestic matters to the plane of moral and spiritual aspects of life. He compels us to look at life with new seriousness. He halts our reckless self-complacency, and makes us pause to see that truly we have a need. One may boast of freedom so unlimited that it runs to license in all things that the world judges by; and yet be an abject slave within himself. And to discover this slavery, to lay it bare to us, is the Lord's first task in achieving our salvation. Paul had reached this condition when he said:

> The good that I would, I do not: but the evil that I would not, that I do. . . . For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: but I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O, wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?

It was to teach, by analogy, just this lesson, that Israel was allowed to betray herself into national bondage—to Egypt, to Assyria, to Babylon, and to Rome. It was to illustrate just how wretched spiritual slavery could be, that they were permitted to know the tortures of natural slavery. And because the natural life becomes a hard task-master, and is seen to be intolerable when the soul wakes up, therefore we read of Israel's treatment in Egypt:

> They did set over them taskmasters to afflict them with their burdens. . . . And the Egyptians made the children of Israel to serve with rigor. And they made their lives bitter with hard

bondage, in mortar, and in brick, and in all manner of service in the field.

Blessed is the hour, with any man, which brings to him the consciousness that his bondage to the natural—the self-hood plane of life—has grown "bitter," and that because of that self-hood life and because of that alone, his life is made "bitter with hard bondage." For then it is that he first cries out for freedom. And in his search, he learns, as did Paul, that, "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom."

To the non-religious man, the man whose spiritual nature is not yet awake—as shown by the Jews who thought they "were never in bondage to any man"—it seems absurd when he is told that he is not free. Yet the truth is, that he is bound by a thousand cords reaching back through heredity to appetites and yearnings and passions and impellings, which steer his course constantly against the upward moving "stream of Providence," whose constant effort is to turn his course about and bear him on its bosom up through spheres of freedom that are real.

Such a man, because of his clashes with the "stream of Providence," congratulates himself that he is in freedom to oppose that stream, which to follow he thinks would be the most stifling sort of slavery. He conceives that he now is free because he thinks and wills and does undriven the things he wants to do. But let him pause a moment, and think quite candidly. Does he do these things undriven? What mysteries make him want the things he wants? Are they not forces that press down to him through avenues reaching back through portions of his nature to impellings that he has not named? So after all, is not his present sense of freedom due to his yielding to the currents of some other urge heredity has set in motion, and in so identifying it with himself that he makes its wants his own? Then, after all, what is freedom, as man can sense it, but wanting the thing he is inwardly urged to want? What but wanting the thing he is pleased to want?

Then it is apparent that one can have the sense of being

free in the pursuit of one set of wants, as well as of another, so long as they only conform to the "stream" or course of that inward urge which he has elected to follow. Man can change his wants, by changing the urge which he will listen to. Of all the offices of freedom this is the most important.

Man goes on for a season not knowing this. Some go far through life not knowing it; some, alas, all through life. But the Lord all the while is trying to get their ear, trying in every possible way without destroying freedom, to get them to "believe on Him" long enough to seriously consider His claim. And that claim is this: That all the urgings that man feels within him, pressing him on to certain wants, divide themselves, when sifted, into two classes diametrically opposed; that the particular promptings of each class are like so many rivulets flowing toward one centered purpose, wherein all together, of that class, come down as one mighty "stream": and so flowing through the world our soul lives in, are two great streams, the one moving up, the other moving down. The one we call the "stream of Providence," because it is the stream the Lord provides —the urge, the force, the power that lifts to heaven. The other we have not named, because it is not the Lord's. It is as characteristically selfish, as the Lord's is unselfish. It leads as insistently down as the Lord's leads surely up. This is the Lord's claim, which He presses upon every ear that will pause to listen. And then He asks: Which "stream" is most worth your while to follow? You are free to go with the stream of life, O man! and you are free to go with the nameless stream. Which freedom do you choose?

While in this world, man stands midway between two worlds, a world of evil, and a world of good. From the one below come promptings and urgings which grow stronger and more frequent with every evil we ever do, or listen to with thought of doing; and so from this comes every force that can in any way contribute to man's enslavement and undoing. And so freedom to do evil means freedom only to be a slave, and more and more a slave, to

forces that grow but darker and deeper, and ever more binding and more mercilessly exacting. But from that other world above comes every influence and prompting and appeal that the angels and the Lord Himself can add to every smallest good we do, or think of with desire to do, that may be divinely used to help man upward toward the freedom that makes truly free, and makes man really *man* as he was meant to be. Omnipotence is on this side. And we are free to choose it.

This promise of genuine freedom does not mean that the man who receives it does not any more have to struggle. The whole of life is a struggle. When Israel reached the Promised Land her battling was not over; rather, it was only well commenced. Christian freedom is not an abandonment of restraints, because that would be a life without order, a life self-destructive and socially destructive. The life of Christian freedom is one lived not as if itself were the only life in existence, but one lived in full recognition of a whole universe of other lives, and as considerate of the well-being of those other lives as of itself.

Because of this social aspect of Christian freedom, it must have restraints. But with the Christian they are self-imposed. He is not compelled to them by some force from without. He is informed of the laws of life as God in superior wisdom has provided them, and is told how he ought to live, but he does not have to observe or obey. If there is any compelling done, the man himself must do it. And this, he is taught, he ought to do. He ought to compel himself to keep the laws that the Lord has revealed. He ought to be master of himself; and the Lord helping him he can be.

But the reason that when the Christian compels himself to keep the laws of the Christian religion, he nevertheless is free, is that those laws are laws in harmony with the plan of the entire universe, the keeping of which inevitably contributes to the well-being of the whole and of each and every single part. Hence it is that the more one compels himself to keep these laws, the greater the order in his life,

and with that, the greater becomes the sense of freedom.

It should be easy to see, when man can be induced to pause long enough to consider it, that the freedom that leads one up is greater than the one that leads him down. For with elevation comes expansion, extension of vision, and removal of pressure; while with descent there is contraction, narrowing of vision, and increasing pressure and sense of weight. The one is a growing freedom; the other is a contracting freedom. Hence it becomes clear, that there is, after all, but one real freedom. And this is Christian freedom; for this is the only freedom that expands and lifts, and grows on forever to a better and larger manhood. Growing smaller cannot continue for ever. The earth's center is the limit downward; but the farthest star is not the limit upward. Freedom in being selfish has its direction downward—centered in self; freedom in being unselfish has its direction upward—centered in the Lord. "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." His freedom attunes you to the vibrations of all the onward moving universe, and turns your discord into music; it finds for you your fitted place in the heaven-directed orchestra of the Great Company of all heavenward-growing souls.

Of course this sounds as if it were a miracle. It is. "Can a man be born again?" Yes, he can. Spiritually he can lose his old identity; put off his old citizenship; renounce the whole stream whose course his past had followed; choose an entirely new set of promptings and urgings, to make his own and be actuated by; and, in all essential respects, start life all over again. We *can* be born again. We can be "born from above." And "if ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them."

The Lord will give us, when in humility we ask Him, a new will; will take away "the heart of stone" and give us instead, "the heart of flesh," which the Prophet pictures. Into our minds now heavenward turned, He implants a will-to-righteousness, a will from Himself, the will to walk in Wisdom's ways, to know and love and do the Will of God.

This will is first given through repentence, and through exercise thereafter it is that it grows. It claims nothing for itself, nothing of merit for the man; but everything from the Lord. All power is His; all grace is His; all righteousness. Of His mercy the man receives; and in His strength goes forward, possessed of a strength that is not his own, and yet feeling it as his own; rejoicing more and more in a new-found manhood, a new-experienced freedom. So he proves in never-ending wonderment, how "a life of freedom is simply and solely being led by the Lord," Whom to know and follow is "life eternal," both now and hereafter.

So he has known the truth the Word reveals, and "the truth has made him free" with respect to truth,—free in mind, free in understanding; but more than this, above and beyond it all, he has come to know the Lord in Person, the holy, comforting, strengthening, living Presence, God-with-us in His glorified and Divine Humanity; and this has made him free in his life: free in the name and the strength of the glorified Lord Jesus,—in his whole being, through and through, a man made free; a man advancing in the harmony of order which makes of life the symphony the Lord ordained.

EVERETT K. BRAY.

COME TO JESUS

By Edmond Congar Brown

"COME unto Me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest!"

This short sentence, of but seventeen simple words, is without doubt the most wonderful sentence which has ever been spoken. It has been well said that it contains the whole philosophy of human life. This is true, but far more is true of it. It contains the whole of religion; it contains an answer to every human problem, a comfort for every human sorrow, and a healing balm for every human wound and sickness. It sums up the whole Gospel and tells in a single phrase the complete story of the true relation of God and man.

It is an interesting coincidence (if nothing more) that in our English version this sentence contains seventeen words. Our Writings teach that the number seventeen signifies the ending of an old state and the beginning of a new one. And there can be no greater or more radical change of state for anyone of us than is involved in the yielding to this Divine invitation. It involves the complete surrender of the old selfish, worldly life, and the taking up of a new life of loving service to Jesus. It involves taking up a yoke—but it is *His* yoke, and because it is borne with Him, it is easy, and its burden is light. There is no other way of obtaining rest and peace, save by coming to Jesus, taking up this yoke, and forever afterward bearing it with Him.

But, you ask, what is the need of saying all this to a New-Churchman? We have given up the errors of the old beliefs, we are full-fledged receivers of the Heavenly Doctrine revealed in our Writings, we believe that the Lord is present with us in the Word and in the Writings, and we

are trying to live the truths which we find there; what more is there to do? But—we may be all this and yet have never truly known the real God of the New Church. We may have believed all these things and done all these things and yet never have come to Jesus. For, as I hope to show in what follows, the real God of the New Church is not a transcendental unapproachable Being, mystically present in the Word and in the Writings; or rather He is indeed all of that, but He is also much more; He is a Divine Man. And though infinite, He is none the less a man like ourselves, having been through all our trouble and experiences, understanding all our thoughts and feelings, a man that we can talk to, as it were face to face, and who answers us again, as one man to another. This Divine Man once lived on this earth for our sake, and died a very painful death here, also for our sake. And although now the earthly body which He assumed when He came here to live has been glorified and made Divine and can no longer be seen with our material eyes, He is nevertheless just the same human man as before. When He came here to live, He chose a name, and asked that He be called by it, and He still bears it—the name JESUS. And this Jesus, and none else, is the God of the New Church. Have we ever really known Him? Let each one of us answer this question in his own heart.

In the posthumous work on "The Athanasian Creed" it is said that the first and primary thing of a Church is to know its God, because everything else depends upon that knowledge; that this was the first and primary thing in the conjunction of God with man, and is now the first thing of the Church which is called the New Jerusalem (Athanasian Creed, n. 65). It seems obvious that this must be true. The idea of God is the foundation of all religion, and according to the fullness and trueness of the idea of God which prevails in any Church, so will be the religion of that Church. What, then, is the idea of God which prevails in the New Church? Is it true and adequate, or have errors and weaknesses crept in which have rendered it incomplete

and inaccurate? I believe that this is the case, and that in this can be found the cause of the slow growth of the external Church.

All religion has relation to life—to the life of love to the Lord, and obedience to His Commandments. And the great object of religion is, as its name indicates, the *binding* of the soul to God, or conjunction with God. And we are taught that the religion of the New Church involves the binding of the Soul to, or its conjunction with, a visible, accessible, human God. In the posthumous tract entitled "God the Savior, Jesus Christ," it is said "Man cannot be conjoined with God except by means of a visible and accessible Human" (n. 34) and "No one comes to God or is conjoined to Him unless the Human is approached, otherwise God is not accessible" (n. 45) and "In order that there may be conjunction there must be a visible God, thus one accessible and fixed" (n. 47). We are further told that "No one comes into the New Jerusalem, who does not acknowledge the Divine Human of the Lord" (De Domino, n. 34) and that "Those who approach the Lord alone, think of a Divine Human, thus of God as a Man" (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 12).

What do we mean by the Divine Human of the Lord? We mean the human aspect of the Infinite Jehovah. No man has seen God, that is, the Infinite Esse, at any time, and no one can ever see Him, as He is in His Infinite Power and Glory. But this does not mean that we cannot see God in an aspect suited to our finite vision. "The only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him" (John 1: 18).

This only begotten Son is the Divine Human aspect, or face, of the Infinite Jehovah. He is the Human assumed by God when He wanted to come down closer to us than He had ever been before—an infirm assumed Human at first, but finally completely glorified and made Divine. He is the visible, accessible, fixed, aspect of God referred to in the work above quoted. While this is the only aspect or person of God that man can ever know, it is all-sufficient,

and more than sufficient, for every human need, and presents to us as much of the personality of God as we can ever comprehend. And this personality is presented in such a tender, loving, simple, homely way, that if we once really see Him we can never forget, for He calls out the passionate love and devotion of the whole heart.

This aspect or face of Jehovah, of course, has a name. The Infinite Esse is named Jehovah—a name so holy that in former times it was not lawful to pronounce it. Various appearances or presentations of the Infinite Divine personality before the incarnation were given names expressive of the particular aspects of the Divine Life presented. And when God came down to earth to live here with us awhile in a material human body and to live with us here forever in that same body glorified and made Divine, He assumed a new name expressive of the particular aspect of His infinite personality which was then and forever afterward to be shown to the world—a "visible, accessible, fixed" human being, the Divine MAN who was to be the bridegroom of His bride, the Church. This new Divine Name was—and is—JESUS. Frequently the word "Christ" is added, but Christ is more properly a title, meaning "The Annointed." Jesus means "Savior"; Jesus Christ, "The Annointed Savior." Many passages in the Writings teach that the name of the Divine Human is "Jesus Christ" (see, for instance, Apocalypse Revealed, nn. 6, 15; True Christion Religion, n. 838) and we are particularly told that this "was the Lord's name in the world; thus the name of His Human" (Apocalypse Explained, n. 26). But it is explained more particularly that the name or title "Christ" was on account of the spiritual Divine in the Human, while "from the Celestial Divine the Lord in the world was called 'Jesus'" (Heaven and Hell, n. 24) and that by "Jesus" is meant Divine Good and by "Christ" Divine Truth (Arcana Celestia, n. 3004).

What do we mean by a "name" of God? We are told

the name of God means every quality by which God is worshipped. . . . His quality is manifold, for it comprises all things which

are from Him; so He has many names, and each name involves and expresses His quality in general and in particular (Apocalypse Explained, n. 959).

Many other passages explain more or less fully that a name of God expresses His quality.

"By the name of anyone is meant not only his name, but also his quality" (True Christian Religion, n. 300). "The 'name' is all in one complex by which the Lord is worshipped" (Arcana Celestia, n. 3006).

Therefore, whenever we use the name of "Jesus" we bring vividly to mind, not only to ourselves but also to the angels and good spirits with whom we are associated, the Celestial or love side of our Human Lord and Savior—the tender, loving bridegroom of the Church, the Divine Man who came down to earth and suffered and died for our sakes, who went through all the experiences and who has all the qualities and attributes which are summed up and expressed in His self-chosen earth name "Jesus."

In the Apocalypse Revealed we are told that the words "He that testifieth these things saith, surely, I come quickly, Amen. Even so come, Lord Jesus" signify

The Lord, . . . that He comes in His Divine Humanity which He took upon Him in the world and glorified, as a bridegroom and husband, and that the Church desires Him as a bride and wife . . . and here at the end of the book, the Lord speaks and the Church speaks as bridegroom and bride; the Lord says 'Surely, I come quickly, Amen' and the Church says 'Even so come, Lord Jesus' which are words of dispensation or betrothing unto the spiritual marriage. That the Lord will come in His Divine Humanity Which He took upon Him and glorified in the world, is plain from the circumstance that He names Himself 'Jesus' . . . and from the Church here saying 'Come, Lord Jesus' (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 960).

What a beautiful symbolic picture of the coming of the Divine Bridegroom to His Bride! And how clearly is brought out the thought that the love side, the bridegroom side, of the risen Lord of the New Church is summed up and expressed in His name of love and self-sacrificing devotion—Jesus!

Yes, the Lord Jesus is the God of the New Church. But He is more than the God of the Church—or perhaps it is nearer the truth to say that there is much more in His character as our God than we have understood and appreciated as involved in the relation. When we have thought of Him as our God we have thought of a supremely exalted Being of infinite majesty and power to Whom we should humbly offer our reverence and obedience; but the title "God" has not vividly brought to mind the full quality of the tender, loving Man, Who has voluntarily, from His deep yearning toward us, come down to meet us on our own human level and become our friend and companion as well as our God. To bring out the thought we need His love name, His Savior name, the name He Himself chose to express to us this aspect of His infinite nature, the name which He has told us to use in speaking of Him—Thou shalt call His name Jesus!

But have we of the New Church ever realized that we have such a God? We have been taught, of course, the wondrous majesty of Jehovah, and we know something of the doctrine of the Redemption by the Incarnation of Jehovah as Jesus Christ. Some of us can discourse more or less learnedly about the Esse and Existere, the Divine Celestial, Spiritual, and Natural, the Divine Proceeding, and other holy arcana as to God's nature which have been revealed in the Writings of our Church, and I do not mean to speak of these sacred subjects other than with the greatest reverence; but I am convinced that as a Church we have been too much content to dwell upon these wonderful truths, and have neglected to dwell with loving appreciation upon the simple human nature of our God, and especially upon His affectional side, expressed by His name Jesus.

And we are now experiencing the result of our mental attitude toward Him. Our Church membership increases very slowly. Our Church in itself is "a decadent organization," which if not continually replenished by accessions from outside would cease to exist. We all know that there is something wrong. One of the most popular subjects of

discussion at our meetings and in our periodicals is the question, "Why does not the New Church grow faster," and many different answers have been given, upon none of which have we been able to agree. But to my mind the reason is clear—it is because, like the Church at Ephesus mentioned in the Apocalypse, we have left our first love! We have dwelt too much upon truths of doctrine, important and vital though these be, and have neglected the affectional side of our relations to our Lord Jesus. We have suffered our first warm love to the newly revealed Divine Human Lord to grow cold, we have become reluctant or even a little ashamed to use His chosen name, lest we be thought like our simple friends of the Old Church from whom we have separated. The result is that our religious life is feeble, incomplete and unsatisfying; we are becoming lifeless, and unless we remember from whence we have fallen and repent and do the first works, He will come quickly and remove our candlestick out of its place (Rev. II; 4, 5). We are told that these words mean that in a Church which primarily or in the first place respects the truths of doctrine, the interiors of the mind are not opened and the truths do not clearly appear in their own light, and finally all illumination is removed and the truths are seen no more (Apocalypse Revealed, nn. 82-85).

We all feel more or less strongly that something is lacking in our Church life, but we know not what. This lack is felt most intensely by those who come into our organization from the Old Church. Though I have been for over forty years in the New Church, I still remember well my feeling of disappointment and loss, and I think most of our converts feel something of this—I know many do. If you ask any old church convert to the New Church, after he has been in long enough to become acclimated, what he thinks of us, he will usually, while expressing delight in our rational and satisfying doctrines, and granting the wonderful beauty of the new truths he has learned, complain more or less vaguely of something lacking, something he misses, without which all the rest seems cold and

unsatisfying. And this feeling is so strong, that, as we know, many converts drop back into the Old Church, carrying with them, let us hope, the new truths which they have learned; and many of our young people brought up in the New Church leave it for other circles where they can find what is lacking here.

What is this vital lack which so impresses a real Christian coming from the Old Church into the New? What is this sense of loss which these converts experience? It is the loss of the tender, loving, homely, every-day friend and companion that the simple good in the Old Church recognize as God—the Divine Man Jesus. The Old Church is avowedly founded on a belief in Jesus, and with those of its members who are devout there is without question not only a deep love for Him, but also a daily communion with Him—a *living with* the unassuming, gentle, companionable Divine Man who is disclosed to us in the New Testament. When a Christian having deep in his heart such an idea of God comes into the New Church and becomes familiar with our conception of the risen Lord, Whom we have in our thought glorified to such a degree that He is no longer to us a dear friend to Whom we can talk familiarly face to face as one man talks to another—when our convert really comprehends our thought about the matter he exclaims in his heart "they have taken away my Lord and I know not where they have laid Him!"

I have long thought that we of the New Church could profit by knowing better our friends in the Old Church. And recently, by a series of very interesting experiences which came to me entirely unsought, I have been thrown closely into contact with some of the earnest, devout remnant of the Old Church who still have the spirit of real Christianity in the heart, and I have come to feel that in some ways they are nearer to God than we are. Those of us who have always been in the New Church know very little of the habits of thought, at this day, of the real Christians not yet of our organization. Perhaps they are not many—we may concede that the old churches are vast-

ated and defunct, but still there is a remnant there who either have not heard of the New Church or else have heard of it but do not like our way of trying to carry it into effect, and these few make up in earnestness and activity what they lack in number.

Whatever we may think of the present state of the Christian Church, we must admit that as an organization it had a very good foundation and that it has accomplished a great deal in the past, including among other things the complete reorganization of a large part of the world upon a greatly improved plan, and we must admit that there have been in the past a great many not only good and devout but also able and wise men among its members. Perhaps there may be some there yet, and perhaps it might be a good idea to look into the way they think and feel and act in their religious life. I do not mean on controverted points of doctrine, as to which we differ from them, and very properly so, but I mean as to their way of looking at the great central truths of Christianity, which we share with them—the fundamental things of all religion; as, for instance, and I would put this above everything else, the belief in and conception of and feeling toward a personal, human God.

We should be very careful not to repeat the mistake which was made at the time of the Reformation, when those who separated from the Catholic Church rejected many things merely from a desire to be as different from the former church as possible. We should prove all things and hold fast to that which is good, even though we find it in the Old Church, from which we have come out.

There is in the Old Church no doubt much hypocrisy, and much apparently devout talk which is really only pietistic cant. There is also much false doctrine and many erroneous habits of thought which those who come out of it should correct or put away. But for all that there is much that is real and true and precious. We are accustomed to think of the Old Church as a hot-bed of tritheism, but this is by no means entirely true. There is there a rem-

nant of real followers of the Lord, and with such there cannot be gross falsity, for it is written "If any man will do my will, he shall know of the doctrine." I have known a number of Christians in recent years who never heard of the New Church of Swedenborg who yet believed and clearly understood that Jesus Christ is Jehovah Himself who came down to earth and assumed a human body. Some modern evangelistic speakers and writers seem to be very clear in their idea that Jehovah and Jesus are the same, though of course many still remain in the grosser forms of tritheistic doctrine. Please note the following from S. D. Gordon, a well-known speaker who addresses large audiences and of whose books over a million copies have been sold:

Jesus is God spelling Himself out in language that man can understand. God and man used to talk together freely. But one day man went away from God. And then he went further away. He left home. He left his native land, Eden, where he lived with God. He emigrated from God. And through going away he lost his mother-tongue. . . . God has always been eager to get to talking with man again. The silence is hard on Him. . . . Of course He had to use a language that man could understand. Jesus is God spelling Himself out so man can understand. (Quiet Talks about Jesus, p. 13.)

Jesus was God letting man see the beauty of His face and listen to the music of His voice, and feel the irresistibly gentle drawing power of His presence (Idem, p. 171).

He was the person of God wearing a human coat and human shoes, hand-pegged, walking in freely amongst us that we might get our tangled up ideas about God and ourselves and about life untangled, straightened out. He was God Himself wrapped up in human form coming close that we might get acquainted with Him all over again (Quiet Talks on John's Gospel, p. 51).

Our Lord Jesus was the face of God looking longingly into men's faces. . . . He was the voice of God talking into men's ears. . . . He was the hand of God, strong and warm, reaching down to take men by the hand and give them a strong lift up and back to the old Eden life. . . . He was the heart of God, tender and true, beating rhythmically in time and tune with the human heart. . . . Our Lord Jesus was the person of God in human shape and human garb, come down close, to draw us men back

again to the old trysting place under the Tree of Life (Quiet Talks on Following the Christ, p. 11.)

Mr. Gordon is, I believe, not yet familiar with our Writings, his wisdom being evidently derived from the general influx of new truth which flows into the hearts of all who are trying to do the Lord's will, but how clearly the truth of the one God is stated. It is curious, also, to note his phrase "Our Lord Jesus was the face of God" and compare it with the Writings—"The Lord is the very face of Jehovah" (Arcana Celestia, nn. 10, 579).

I think we must drop the idea that all in the Old Church are tritheists. Many are, no doubt, but not all. We are not the only people who know who God is—in fact, as I said before, and let me say it again, very thoughtfully, it may be that some of the Old Church remnant know God better than we do. And if you ask why I say this, I must answer, because they know JESUS, while we know, or think we know, a Divine Being Whom we imagine as so glorified that we never can see Him, or hear His voice, or feel the loving touch of "the hand that was pierced for us."

The real Christians in the Old Church love to think about "Jesus." They centre their whole religious life on Him—the Divine Man Who came into the world to save them from their sins, Who lived and worked here for a lifetime, going through all the human experiences and pains and sorrows that we can ever have, who was tempted in all points like as we are, so that He understands all our feelings and emotions, Who at the last suffered for us an incredibly painful death on the cross, hanging there in agony, bodily and mental, for many long hours, Who rose again triumphant over all the powers of hell and Who now lives *for us,* glorified, no doubt, but still just the same Divine MAN that He was while on earth, understanding each one of us more completely than our nearest human friend, loving us more tenderly than a father or mother or husband or wife can ever love, always standing beside us, ready to listen to our prayers, eager to help us, yearning for our love in return with a yearning we cannot comprehend or conceive of,

because it is an infinite yearning, needing us—let me say it as softly and reverently as I can, but still very positively —needing us more than we need Him, for He made us in the first place because He needed living human souls to return His love and satisfy His yearning! How can we of the New Church give up such a beautiful conception of a Divine Friend and Master! Let each one of us answer in his own heart how he has responded to such wonderful love and how he has answered to the yearning need of Jesus for our love in return!

A real Christian in the Old Church, in his conversation about the things of religion and in his hymns and religious songs, loves the name "Jesus," with all the simple, homely ideas which cluster around it. The children sing "Jesus loves me," "There is no love like the love of Jesus," and many others, while in the older circles the favorite hymns are such as "Jesus, lover of my soul" or "Jesus, I my cross have taken." The constant urging to the "unsaved" is "Come to Jesus," and becoming saved, or being "converted," is tenderly spoken of as "giving the heart to Jesus." They are anxious to tell the story of Jesus to all who are ignorant of it—"Go, with the name of Jesus, to the dying, and speak that name in all its living power!" The watchword and countersign is always JESUS. "What a friend we have in Jesus!" they exclaim, and the heart cries out in rapture "Jesus, the very thought of Thee with sweetness fills my breast!"

> Oh Jesus, Jesus, dearest Lord,
> Forgive me, if I say,
> For very love, Thy sacred name
> A thousand times a day!
> Oh, wonderful! that Thou shouldst let
> So vile a heart as mine
> Love Thee with such a love as this
> And make so free with Thine!

All this is what the Old Church convert misses when he comes into the New Church—misses sometimes with so bitter a longing that he slips back again into the old ways of

thinking. And I verily believe, this is what our young people, brought up in the New Church, miss, though they may not know what is lacking. They know something is lacking, and they search for it, and some of them find it, in devout Old Church associations.

This ought not to be. There is no reason why it should be so. God is not far away; He is not an incomprehensible, mystic divinity so glorified and exalted that He is no longer our friend. He is very near to each one of us. He feels for us. He understands us. He is a MAN, with all a man's thoughts and feelings and emotions, a human man just like ourselves, though infinite. How could it be otherwise, when He made us in His image and likeness? And these ideas of His Manhood, of His human similarity to ourselves, all cluster around the name Jesus.

Why should we in the New Church dislike to use the name Jesus? That it is rarely used we all know. We often speak of "the Lord" or even "Christ," but these are titles, not His name. We seldom hear the name "Jesus" in our sermons, or read it in our Church papers. In a recent number of the "Messenger," taken at random, "Lord" appears a great many times, "God" and "Christ" also quite frequently, but "Jesus," the real name of Him of Whom we are speaking, only once. We dislike to use this name, and always cast around for some substitute. There is a feeling that it belongs to simple and childlike states, and that we have outgrown such things, and, alas, perhaps that is true, but let us remember that he that receiveth not the kingdom of God as a little child shall not enter therein.

Why should we shrink from the use of this name? There is nothing in it to be ashamed of. It is Jehovah God's own chosen earth name—chosen by Himself when He came down to live our human life with us forever as a man like ourselves. Joseph was distinctly told, "Thou shalt call His name Jesus," and we are told that after He was born "His name was called Jesus, which was so named of the angel before He was conceived in the womb." God Himself assumed this name Jesus, with His human body, so as to be

able to love us better and have us love Him better than had ever been before, and shall we imagine that we are too wise or too important or too grown-up and dignified to use this simple name, and insist upon using some other name or title? When discussing theological matters in a scientific way, as even in the Writings of the Church, it is of course permissible to use the title "Lord" as Swedenborg does, rather than the dear familiar name of Jesus, which may well be reserved for loving and tender talk about Him or with Him, but Swedenborg makes it perfectly clear that His earth name in its highest form is Jesus, and he explains that when he speaks of "the Lord" he always means "the Savior of the world, Jesus Christ" (Arcana Celestia, n. 14).

In our intercourse with our close friends we never address them by their titles; we call them by their names. Especially would this always be the case if our friend had chosen a name himself and asked us to use it in speaking to him or of him. Why should not this apply to our nearest and dearest friend Jesus? Certainly the name itself is a beautiful one and has a pleasing melody. "How sweet the name of Jesus sounds in a believer's ear!" Its meaning could not be higher—Savior—perhaps a little more literally "Victor-Savior." It has been well said that "the very name is a shout of victory!"

We need this holy name if we are to be true New-Churchmen. Our Church will never prosper, and we as individuals will never be close to our Divine Friend and Master until we learn to use this "shout of victory" in our everyday thought and conversation. Do not be misled; do not think it is a mere matter of words, and that any other holy name or sacred title can ever take the place of the one self-chosen name of our leader, JESUS. As I have pointed out above, the name we use to designate a person involves far more than the mere name itself; it expresses our idea of his quality. This name, and the accompanying idea of quality, is necessary to bring us into close and loving relation to Him. We cannot be saved without it.

On a memorable occasion not long after the crucifixion,

the apostle Peter, "being filled with the Holy Ghost" (and therefore inspired, so that what he said is authoritative), preaching one of his stirring sermons, pronounces the name of "Jesus Christ of Nazareth," and declares the mighty truth "there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved" (Acts IV: 12). In the Divine Human MAN Jesus there is all power, from firsts to ultimates; He is the Alpha and the Omega; in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. He says "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth" (Matt. XXVIII; 18) and His name—His real, own name, Jesus, has in itself wonderful power, we are told, so that it cannot even be named by any devil in hell (True Christian Religion, n. 297) and it is a protection against all the power of the hells (Ibid., n. 380). " 'Jesus' means safety, salvation, and Savior" (Arcana Celestia, n. 3005). Many wonderful accounts are given by devout Christians of the power of the repetition of the mere name itself to save from temptation, to guard against danger, and even to heal disease. This is a well attested fact, widely known among Old Church people, but little known by us.

Do not think, however, that I am urging a blind magical reliance on a name merely, even so holy a name as Jesus. "The worship of a name only is no worship, and may also be found among the worst of men, who thereby profane the more" (Ibid., n. 2724). But I am trying to present, as earnestly and forcibly as I can, an urgent plea for a return to the intimate friendship with and loving worship of the Divine Man, our Lord Jesus, which has prevailed in the past, and which still prevails, even in the Old Church, among the simple good there. And I have tried to show that this state of mind is necessarily associated with and strengthened by the use of the name which He has chosen and made known to us to express His qualities of Savior, Master, friend, lover and bridegroom. And I would above all urge that we try to realize how deep and tender is the love of this Divine Man Jesus, and how earnest and eager is His yearning for our love in return. I would try to

emphasize the thought, too little dwelt upon, of the Lord's need for us. We know intellectually, even though we may not feel it emotionally, that we need Him, but do we ever stop to appreciate the corollary of this, that He needs us? That He needs us so much that He created us, that He once died for us, that He now lives for us, tenderly watching over us every moment with a wonderful care, giving us everything which is good and withholding as far as we will let Him everything harmful, always trying, wisely and patiently, to lead us to Himself because He wants our love and because He knows we can only be happy when we give our hearts to Him and love Him as fervently and completely as He loves us. Do we ever begin to realize all that this means? In and all through everything I would try to say is running the thought of the intimate, loving *nearness* of the Lord Jesus as a personal human God-Man who is our friend and lover, and of His wish that we should so think of Him, and speak of Him, and talk with Him, and rely upon Him, surrendering our whole life to Him to take and use as He may see fit.

Let us think of Him as intimately and simply as our teacher Swedenborg did, to whom Jesus appeared in person. He says:

> I lifted up my hands and prayed, when a hand came and strongly pressed my hands; I then continued my prayer, and said: "O Thou, who hast promised to receive all sinners, Thou canst not otherwise than keep Thy word!" I lay on His bosom and looked at Him face to face. It was a countenance with a holy expression, and so that it cannot be described: It was also smiling and I really believe that His countenance was such during His life upon earth.

How different this from the idea of a far-away, inaccessible, transcendentally-glorified God upon which we in the New Church are accustomed to reflect!

We may not, in this world, ever have the actual, objective vision of the Lord Jesus which was vouchsafed to Swedenborg. We are not prepared as he was to have our spiritual eyes opened and see face to face. But we may, if we will, see Him with the eyes of the soul. We may, if we only

will, "Come to Jesus," weary, worn, sad, repenting of our evil, imploring His help, and He will take away all the burden of our sin and help us to follow in His footsteps forever afterwards. And, if we are sincere in our self-surrender to Him, He will grant to us to feel His actual presence, and to interiorly see Him as vividly as if we really saw Him with our bodily eyes. And when we have this wonderful experience the whole world is changed, nothing can ever be as it was before, doubt has gone, sorrow and sadness have gone, the peace of God which passeth all understanding has come into our hearts, never to leave us, and forever afterwards we walk through life with our Friend and Master, Jesus.

Let me quote the beautiful description of this experience from one of S. D. Gordon's books—"Following the Christ":

> May I tell you a little bit about it? Yet, mark you, only a little bit. You can never *tell* another one what it means to see *Him.* When once the sight has come, every word you utter about it, or Him, seems so lame and weak that you despair of ever being able to let out at your lips what has gotten into you. But let me try, even if lamely, in the eager yearning that it may help you to know if, thus far, you have missed seeing *Him,* and maybe—so much better—help you to *see* Him. For until you have—well, nothing, absolutely nothing, is worth while.
>
> When you see Him there comes such a sense of *His purity* that, instantly, you are down on your face in utter despair, because of your own self—your impurity; your lack of purity; the sharp contrast between Him and you. . . . And that vivid sense of contrast between Him and you never grows less, but more acute and deeper. Even when you come to know Him better, and the sweet peace comes with its untellable balm to your spirit, yet you are always conscious of the contrast, and you know that *you* are not pure; only *He* is. . . . With that comes such a sense of *Himself,* of His—what word can tell it?—His glory, which means simply His character, what He is in Himself—that again words can never tell out the sense of your own littleness; no, that is not the word, your own *nothingness.* And now you recall, with an inner shrinking, how well you have thought of yourself, how much you have talked about yourself and your view of things, perhaps in the language of a properly phrased humility. Now you are dumb. His presence dumbs you. You begin to wonder at the

strange self-confidence and self-complacence that have been so common even in your holiest moments and experiences. It seems, in this Presence, as though you could never open your lips again —except to speak of *Him.*

Then your eyes are drawn more intently to His person—His face, His wounds; the scars where the thorns tore His great, patient face; the grief-whitened hair, draped above those deep, tender, unspeakable eyes; that strangely rough place in the palm so lovingly outstretched; the spear-scar, the nail-marks in those feet coming over to you—these grip you. Their meaning begins to come. There's cleansing; yes, blessed fact! there's *cleansing* from this horrid impurity whose stain you are so conscious of. Yet, what it cost Him! What my impurity forced upon Him! . . . I must stay down on my face at His feet. It is the only place for such as I discover myself to be. Yet what grace to let me stay at His feet! . . .

After a little, as you are sitting still in His presence, and have become a bit quieter after the flush of your first emotions at seeing Him, you begin to be caught all anew with how *lovable* He is. . . . That first look made you think mostly of yourself—an inner loathing. Now you think of *Him.* He is so lovable, so true and tender, and patient and pure; again your language gives out, and you feel better content just to look without trying to use words. They're such poor things when it comes to telling about Him. He is so much more than anything that can be said about Him. His will is so wise and thoughtful and far-reaching and loving. Strange how stupid you have been in insisting so strenuously and blindly on having your own way. His plan, His thought about everything concerning you, is so superb. And he asks me to be His follower. What joy! What if the way be a bit rough; it's following *Him;* that's enough. He calls me to be His personal friend. I can hardly take it in. His *friend?* Yes, that's His own word. Well, let any thorns tear because of the narrowing of the road; I'm His friend, man, do you hear? His *friend,*—do you get hold of that word? What can any thorn thing do against that! We may go hand in hand now—His is pierced; I feel the scar where our hands touch. But we're together at last, *the* thing He has been working for. I can feel His presence. I can hear the low music of His voice within. Thorns don't count here. Oh, yes, I *feel* them; they haven't lost their power to slash and sting—but —with Him so close alongside! . . . His presence is peace past understanding but not past appreciation. There's a longing for His Word, a desire to talk with Him even when you don't want to ask for something. . . .

This is the glory of the goal—face to face with Himself. It

begins now . . . But this is only a beginning. There will be the far greater glory of the final goal, as we come into His immediate presence, literally face to face. . . . And we shall be sharers in His glory . . . but we shall be thinking only of Himself—face to face!

Does not the heart burn with eagerness to follow such a Savior? Shall we follow Him? Shall we *not* follow Him? Does not the eye grow moist and the breath come faster as we resolve, now, to surrender all our life to this wonderful Jesus? Oh, let us, now, as we read these words, now at this moment, fall devoutly on our knees, and with humble and reverent love say, Even so come, LORD JESUS!

EDMOND CONGAR BROWN.

THE CHILDREN AND THE CHURCH

By Alice Archer Sewall James

IT is impossible that we should not all feel the same thing at this moment, a yearning to save the Sunday school. We cannot blind ourselves to the fact of its extremity any longer, which includes so many other terrible extremities, chiefly the falling away of the youth in the church. The children are not with us in church; they do not sit in our pews with us; they remain in the little yearly festival processions for a short while, then their crowding lives, education, college, business, who knows what, takes them away; the frail link with the altar is broken and it is a chance, a bare chance, if ever they return to its service. We have held the feeling, with prayers and tears, that, having sowed Remains, the seed is sure to spring; and we have trusted, that by patiently instructing them in their childhood with a careful system of lessons that in their maturity they will enter the Church as New-Churchmen, and then after all come and sit beside us to worship. But do they do it? Where are the children of twenty years ago? If we had kept them, would we be so few and poor today? Why did we not keep them? Is there something we did not give them in their littlest years?

I know that there is a feeling abroad in the Church that our only hope in these dark times is in the brave of spirit, and loath would I be to class myself outside of or behind these. For they have for their standard the affirmative attitude, a kind of optimism which is peculiarly the right of every New-Churchman. But I think it is a mistake to set that affirmative attitude in opposition to a wholesome dread of failure. Such a course tends to the relaxing of the whole spiritual attention, cultivates a mental *laissez faire,* which is not affirmation but indifference. We cannot affirm

unless we appreciate the negative. It is in this spirit of affirmation that something *can* be done that I wish to approach the negation of our Sunday school experience. In it we have not made good.

There are many who will prefer to leave, or perhaps to hide, the whole matter under that trusting bravery that has shielded all the early life of the Church, the bravery which has staked its all on some indefinitely postponed glory, accepting as its very attributes the meagre poverty of today. While there is a beauty in this resignation, when it is genuine, which we might permit ourselves to enjoy after great stress of soul, it can be neither beautiful nor genuine if assumed to prevent that stress. There is a habit of postponement, a spiritual procrastination, as dangerous to the New Church as it is to the institutions of earth. Lest we should be inviting such a habit unawares, let us investigate the immediate position of the Sunday school in its relation to the church body.

The Sunday school was instituted as a place of instruction for the young in things of religion. Perhaps it has failed with us because it is not and cannot be also a place of education in these things. For education implies a bringing up,—a rearing, a breeding, as well as the imparting of knowledge. Many and deep have been the premonitions of this difference among the laborers on Sunday school committees and those who designed its little services and catechisms, and with skill and prayerful foresight they have built up a ritual for the child which is intended to provide for this deeper human growth. This may be said not only of our own Sunday schools but of the Christian Sunday school movement at large. From whatever devout and diligent source among men, there has grown up in every town and community a little church for the children, which through the very earnestness of its promoters has gradually become more and more a separate body from the congregation proper. It has been remarked by someone that a characteristic sight to the churchgoer on Sunday morning is the throngs of children coming away from

church. As the congregation enters, they depart, and it is time to pause and consider what they take away from us as they run past.

We do not have to consider long. The incessant little flutter as of wings, the gleaming of unquiet sunny heads, the dropping of inevitable pennies, the continual delicate stress and strain of home, the invisible complication of human adjustments, the almost flooding atmosphere of forgiveness and forbearance, and the accentuated effort to rise above ourselves; these are a part of their heavenly entourage, gone with them when they go. It is not so long nor so wholly gone from the churches but that we still feel it is dimly there; now and then a child returns with his parents, and I suppose there is no one in the cold order of the place but is grateful to him for so doing; but as an habitual Christian experience it has all but vanished.

Of course, it is a perfectly possible thing to have the children with us in the pews. They belong to us, are tender and little, and parents can generally have them where they want them. The reason then that they are not in the pews with us is from one of two causes, either that their presence is not desirable, or that there is a general conviction that they are better employed elsewhere. Of the first possibility, having already reviewed their influence in a congregation, it is scarcely necessary to speak, unless it be from the point of view of the pulpit. A loved and able preacher, not so long gone from among us, once told me that to him the conditions in a church most conducive to a good sermon were a baby banging a bunch of keys on the front pew and an old man snoring on the back. The family atmosphere thus radiated, warmed his whole soul, and he felt he could reach the people; he had them all there.

As to the children's better employment elsewhere and the educative influence of the Sunday school: there is, of course, a great variety in the form of the Sunday school service and the manner of conducting it. But there is one common quality to the hour all over the land, and that is

the absence of the great altar in its active fullness. Sunday school rooms are usually well-provided for their holy work, and the open Word wherever it is diffuses heaven to those who can receive it. Also, it may be argued, many Sunday schools are held in the church itself in the very presence of the altar. But a certain sphere is lacking. Under the finest circumstances, with all the happy devoutness that can be poured into the songs and verses there can nothing else be made of the Sunday school service than a substitution, a secondary church.

Now I think there can no argument hold against the deteriorating influence of a great thing taken at less than its greatness. Translate this rule into whatever secular field you please, the day school, the Greek fables, the theatre, the college, politics or poetry, the habit of substituting a lesser for the full significance of each, indiscernibly dulls the sensibilities that attack it, and little by little renders them incapable of a genuine receptivity. It may seem that this puts a ban on those intimate lay services of the parlor or bedside, or any worship where "two or three are gathered together" beyond the visible presence of the altar. But in these the altar, to which we have gone for food so many times, sanctifies the act even afar off, even, as Solomon says, in that land whither we are carried captives, by our turning to it in remembrance. I mean, we have had the great experience of the externals of worship with which ever after we can furnish a temple howsoever improvised. It is for those little ones that I speak, who as yet have no externals of worship, no remembrance and no altar.

Can the Sunday school supply it, and with it the essentials of religious education? I think not. I am sure there is no one whose Sunday school experience in childhood has been more precious or lovely than my own; but full and hearty as the ritual was, it never seemed like Church to me. There was a difference. There is still the same difference. Is it valid, and should it exist? Swedenborg classes the instruction of children even with the observing of the sacrament of the Supper among the externals of the bodily atti-

tude of worship. But at the very close of his enumeration of the externals of the mind in worship he says—"Besides thoughts there are also affections which reach the sight and sense of a man." What are those visible affections? How impressively and mysteriously they stand at the end of the very plain category, numbered as one of the *acts* of worship! Affections upon which the eyes may rest. Can the little child look upon them in Sunday school?

Before answering we must recall to mind the unique authority of this hour. Since the children do not go to church, it is all there is of its kind, week after week, through the year and through the years ahead, broken rarely by festive processions when they walk into the presence of the altar and the companionship of their families and sit there in a body together. This is the usual, the normal, cycle of Sunday experiences for the child. Except for one or two other methods followed, of which I shall speak later, it is all he has.

This solitary hour of the child's church is variously handled by its leaders; at its best it has an orderly happy precision of movement, every act being calculated to instruct and train the mind for religious life and requiring an alert attention. In its usual phase, it has a sociable eagerness about it, a well-meaning loose-end devotion, partially efficient. At its worst, it has a chatty unpreparedness, talking down to the children, often trying to make them laugh in order to bring them again. It is not necessary to consider the value of the last two modes, though unfortunately perhaps they are the most widely practised. To take the hour at its best it is not fitted to supply those elements which feed the tender opening sense of God,—that *sight and sense,* the reaching of which Swedenborg includes in worship.

If we wish to enumerate some of those elements—as height, grandeur, spaces of silence, awe and wonder, and grant that they have a certain bearing on the beginnings of religion, are these things to be found in the little churches generally where our children must go? As far as the child knows, they are. The church interior in any

town or village, with its chancel, its altar with the great open Book, its attendant flowers, the strange beauty, quietness and solemnity that live near it, are for him at least the loftiest thing he knows. And in estimating the value of supplying to a child's natural senses the loftiest thing he knows once every seven days, it would not be amiss to glance at the effect his reception of it has upon our own jaded vision. With him beside us, do the scales fall a little from our own eyes? And if we must, in spite of the glory which we try to see with him, see instead a tawdry perhaps a neglected exterior, is it not with a shamed resolve to make and keep these things, for him if for no other reason, as noble as he desires?

Conscious then of the reciprocal importance of this great experience, why, in the child's most susceptible moment, in that clean tender vacancy of mind when impressions strike so deep, and the one great Impression can be made so indelible, are these things withheld from him in our common practice? Because we have neglected to differentiate between instruction and education, between the training of the heart and that of the intellect. It is not that we have laid too much stress on doctrine—woe be to us if we lay less—but not enough on prayer and the sphere of a broken and contrite heart.

What then is to be done? Can the sphere of the church and the altar be brought into the Sunday school? I do not see how it is possible. Even if all altar effects are perfect in our Sunday school rooms, or even if the Sunday school meet in the church in the very presence of the altar, the absence of the fathers and mothers breaks for the child the sequence from earth to heaven, the logical ladder of his uplifting. There are other things in Sunday school against it, a kind of business behavior necessary to the smooth running of a machine, and all the evidences of organization. I know a little boy who, when arriving with his mother at church too early for any of the people, whispered in delighted awe as he stood on the doorstep "Nobody here but the Lord"! He entered stepping in soft wonder as if to

an invisible party. When Sunday school arrives the magic is gone. But in church the presence remains.

Then shall the child, when the church service follows Sunday school, be made to remain and attend it? There are two things that hinder the usefulness of this; the first is his inevitable weariness, if he is little,—(and it is of the little children I am speaking), and the second is that he has already seen it done differently, in a lesser way; he is no longer enthralled emotionally, having been initiated into a certain sophistication as to how things are carried on. The throne once destroyed it is difficult to restore.

When church precedes Sunday school? Ah, then to church of course, but Sunday school in that case is rarely attended at all, and his doctrinal progression is at haphazard. What then? There is another method (referred to above) which has been followed with joy by the children of more than one of our congregations, and that is the use of them in the church choir. This surely is the best that has been done, and may under some advantageous circumstances bear great fruit; but against this unusual and felicitous order of the child's Sunday there are still objections; some of a practical nature, relating to the necessities of attending rehearsals, the expense and labor of proper training, the frequent lack of voices for the singing, the old objection of weariness or at least not freshness of attention, perhaps also the loss of a rare sequestration of mood by reason of familiarity with the business, bench and organ and drilling, and because of the vital little company so physically at hand; but most particularly and especially the objection that he *does not sit with his family.*

And it is on this point that we must base all the stress and strain of argument, for what we have not been able to compass for the child's sake, we may be forced to do for ourselves. We must wake and move his heart with emotion even at the cost of waking our own. No one in the world can do this office for us so well as he, and he is not so efficient in a group of children ahead of us as when he is close against our arm. The very ultimates of human

contact must be reached, and while a whole congregation *can* lean together in mind, embraced as it were in a common charity, it is not often actually so done, and the Influx must therefore necessarily be scattered and interrupted. If groups of those who belong together, by the consecrated bonds of baptism, marriage and home, can really become units of forbearance, forgiveness, praise, and insistent attentive prayer, the conduits of Influx would be cleaned out in the individual parts, and automatically the whole floodgate of Charity would open. In other words, if those who *desire* to be together can bring upon themselves to melt into each other's spiritual arms,—custom and the world forbidding us the physical evidence,—and thus united expand their own receptivity of heaven, the increased force of "power from on high" thus induced would act more freely upon those who do *not* desire to be together. The effect of any appeal we know, scripturally and socially, is doubled by union; and we also know that there is only one union that is vital, or that effects. We can easily picture the weakening of the family should the husband and wife in church sit and worship continually, by choice, apart, and the child still separately. To make the congregational union with God effective, or vital, the different units of the families must perfect their little individual unions, welded into innocence and humility by the encircling breasts of their children. The children thus performing their prophetic task of leading us, can be educated to feel a responsibility in going to church, knowing that they help, that the minister counts on them and needs them, and that something is lacking when they are not good or absent. Their appreciation of this might even be developed to the point of realizing that a certain proportion of unseen angels in the church belong to them, and come with all imaginable blessing when they are there, and are kept away when they fail.

With the whole pull of the modern world in its economic and social evolution being towards the breaking up of the family, with the warmth gone out of the church and

the children not in it, are these matters too casual for our consideration? There is much said in the Writings about confusion of state resulting from a wrong seating in church; if we want to bring the angels back to us what else can we do than, sitting where we belong in worship, inducing as much as we can a sphere of order and repose by the regular recurrence of the same right place, body and mind, and then to put the child in our midst and kneel around him?

For upon condition of this warmth is our admittance to the wedding. We *must* bring it back. We must bring it back at whatever cost of ingenuity and re-arrangement. It is not enough for us to remind ourselves that our place in the Divine order may not be so much of the heart, celestial, as spiritual,—the Faith of the Church's tarrying; (these sophistries are surely a dangerous indulgence). The fact is that the warmth was once among us, from whatever kingdom; that we are not so much in the position of finding ourselves (as the term goes) as of losing ourselves, that instead of rating our ability as of a certain genus, if we cannot keep our children with us we will have no genealogy at all.

Now, as is often the case with radical changes required of us by the Lord, the decision once made, the rest of the way becomes at once surprisingly simple. After the foregoing investigations, we are practically forced to decide that whatever becomes of the Sunday school, the children must spend their holy hour with us in the church. How then can we give them their doctrinal instruction? It can only be done by self-sacrifice. And upon our willingness to undertake such a thing may depend more interior treasure than is my purpose or ability to consider.

A processional hymn can be sung just before the sermon, during which the singing children can gather into line as the procession passes them where they sit in families, and retire for class work during the time allotted to the sermon. A good Presbyterian minister in my own town, upon such a plan being offered to him to solve his like difficulty of no children in church, said that in his Sunday school experi-

ence the actual time for instruction, stripped of all outside program, was from twenty minutes to half an hour. He added that such a course would have to be taken sooner or later. The time for instruction would of course have to be stated and exact, for the returning children with their processional hymn mark the close of the sermon and the taking up of the remaining order of service. There are several things to examine in such a proceeding, first perhaps the casual stranger child who has no family in the church, and enters Sunday school as informally as his own day school. He must be watched for by little sentinels at the door outside, where he can see and feel their welcome, and is then conducted by them to some hospitable family pew which he can ever after consider as his own. The procession takes him in as it moves; but there is one person in that procession, or who awaits it at the classroom door, who demands our special attention. Led by its appointed standard-bearer—and this little office can be brought to a beautiful importance with a banner bearing a motto or watchword—the ranks must inevitably include or end in the teacher, and herein comes the sacrifice. The sermon must be foregone by him, with what compensating reward the quality of the sacrifice can alone determine. For in any of the other possible methods (and there may be an indefinite number) he is bound to sacrifice if he would keep the child in the church, accepting in some manner or function the responsibility for that extra half hour needed to supply the class work hitherto done by the Sunday school. If the class work should not be held during the sermon time, it must be provided for at another time, presumably the afternoon or evening, when the different groups can meet in different neighborhood circles for instruction, with nothing more than a hymn to mark the ritual. There is much fine use that might develop where this could be carried out. The warm pleasure of going to each others' homes, the intimacy between teacher and pupil provided in this less formal contact, the freedom of question and answer and of "getting together." But we know these

meetings in some cases would be impracticable. It can be observed however that where the Sunday schools include widely scattered homes involving long journeys, it is generally the case that the church building possesses a Sunday school room or church-parlor; so that in the one case or the other, simplicity in the natural order, as above referred to, is provided by the Lord. In a word, where the afternoon groups could not be gathered for study because of great distances, the Sunday school room or parlor provides a proper place to which the procession can march: where the procession can march no further than the back seat of the one church room, the congregational homes are generally not so scattered but that afternoon groups for instruction can be gathered together.

There are still other ways in which it can be done, ways in which it is being done now by the evangelical churches in a certain city in northern Ohio. These good people of the different protestant denominations, impressed by the results attained by Catholics in their systematic and daily instruction of their young, and fearing lest the loss of it among themselves in the public schools will work a civic harm, have banded together to supply a Religious Instructor who visits the children daily for a stated time and teaches them the holy things of the church. I do not know the details of this achievement, but the mere fact that it is done has opened another way for us. Can we not at this Convention formulate some organized power to accomplish like ends?

I am aware that even in the simplicity which seems so much a part of these various programs many difficulties will arise. There are conditions, I am sure, quite outside of any of the above categories; and the strange democratic quality of our loosely organized church-life, in its sporadic character, its wide provision for individual growth and its elastic government, demands also an individual tolerance and adjustment. We have in our Sunday school body many ingenious and diligent minds; and the one great thing necessary is the diligent devout mind and heart of

the teacher. For it will be seen that there is, and can be, nothing substituted for the class-work training; the stated lessons as prepared by the Sunday school committee should not in any case need revision or change. This is another item to help our readjustment, that radical as this step will be it need not involve expense or added material. It is merely the hour and manner of the instruction which must be changed—*or we die.*

Is this putting it too strongly? It is the children who are living; it is we who are going. It is the young who are already in possession of the world. It is they who are making it at this moment, not we. What things haunt *them* with beauty, urge *them* with affection, restrain *them* from habit, are being forged and bolted now into the framework of all future covenants among men. We know, the world knows, much that they might have had with which to work has been defrauded them in their infancy. Organizations of Charity and Community Work have begun meekly to assume their bitter responsibility in this matter, and are seeking to make good before too late, by taking the child out of institutional care and putting him into homes. Shall the Church be the slowest to return its child to its home?

Before making our final observations on this subject, let us realize that in order to save the Sunday school we are dismissing it. The hour, the year, the occasion is good for celebrating old forms that have served us and turning to new. Let us not wait until disaster overtakes us, and the Sunday school dissolves itself and closes its doors because there are no children. And in taking the children from the Sunday school let us save for them, not only religious susceptibility, but those finer attitudes of the mind that can only be nourished in the church,—in the habitual familiarity with life at its loftiest, familiarity with the most powerful concrete aspect of humanity as a spiritual thing—men kneeling before an altar. How the little creeping blight of today's cynicism would drop from their habits, how the shell of a mocking devastating society would fall from

their pure growth! Unaware themselves of the portentous difference, they would no longer wish to lounge and chatter in a place which for them had always been the throne-room of a King. Reverence, the ability to revere, to subdue a healthy nature before an invisible sanctity, is not among our leading national characteristics. But today in Boston we are celebrating men who had it, our forefathers who subdued themselves and their surroundings, their natural cravings and their savage enemies because they had it. As an endowment to the state we could offer nothing better than a return of such an attribute in our young men and women, who, as children would easily assimilate it into their blood once they were accustomed never to enter a church *except for immediate worship.*

And how differently the minister himself would develop under the influence of this new element in his audience. The great Bible stories would have to be read with a vivid distinctness and simplicity for the little hearers; every item of his behavior, subjected to the most unsparing criticism in the world, would have a new standard forced upon it. Also how speedily his great task of getting an answer from the congregation would be lightened! The hearty young voices would roll back the *Amens* with a kind of joy in doing it all together. With boys and girls following the ritual, the necessity of wearying and endless announcements of the pages of the Book of Worship would soon go, for they would know it by heart, "from their youth up," and the pages would find themselves under their accustomed fingers. More than this, providing their wandering eyes and thoughts with a definite brilliant engrossing center, the chancel with its pictured windows in bright colors, the altar and its unique and remarkable furnishings, we are setting before them in their ultimate form those visible affections which, remembered, will make all other affections safe. If the letter of the Word is divinely provided with a literary enticement in order to attract the attention and the memory of boys and girls, why may we not consider the building of our churches and the embellishment thereof

to be of like character and importance? Behold, how the very idea of their genuine education in the church is educating us who consider it!

Let then the children thus rest their eyes, while still accustomed to endow what they see with their own "trailing clouds of glory" upon the lovely face of the church,—wreathed in flowers, shining with many lights, mysterious, beguiling, commanding and tender,—a vision to follow them to their graves. Without thus looking upon it, can we expect them to love that face? It is like expecting children brought up with a nurse to love the mother's face which they have never seen. And in making provision for this new course, let us not be alarmed at unfortunate beginnings. There will come many a moment when the unruly little bodies in their restless endurance of the pew and its restrictions will seem to be destroying quicker than they can receive. Let us preserve our own sphere intact, and the Lord will take care of theirs. And in the long strain of the hour, remember that ideas, impressions, visions, intuitions, do not belong to space and time. If the fifty-nine minutes go in playful inattention and the one minute left is absorbed in a fleeting grasp of some celestial verity, the Church has done its vast immeasurable work for that day. And even if all the minutes go during their playful and struggling suppression, we cannot know what heavenly influences seep into their souls, nor when it is accomplished. Does not a child frequently surprise us with announcement of things he has perceived and heard while seeming outwardly dull and blind? Is he not often startling with an unaccountable wisdom? I have in mind at this moment a little child who while fretting in the pew during the reading of the Second Lesson, suddenly sighed out, "There, that's it!" A certain verse had been read, for which apparently he had been longing. If mothers know, why should not the mother church know, that children themselves sometimes solve the problems of their bringing up?

And while considering the possibility of bad behavior in church, let us realize our own responsibility in the matter,

for hitherto it is new to them; have we not expected them to go *from* the church-service rather than *to* it? Have we not permitted them to look upon it as something not intended for them? Not only this, but unfortunately they have in many cases been introduced to church in the lesser manner—have seen the great thing taken lightly, perhaps the aisles of the church being used as a kind of parlor, even like a young people's club-room. It will take some years of habit to undo this wrong, but I think the result upon ourselves will be immediate. I believe on the first Sunday when we sit in families among our little ones a glow will suffuse our whole corporate being. If not, if the individual readjustment is too great for comfort, we must be content to do these things in faith alone. Perhaps we can do them in no other way. Let us only be thankful that we have that much, the clear eye of an intellectual appreciation. It is after all the children who will carry it out as a thing of love, members of that other Church of Charity to which we cannot belong.

Alice Archer Sewall James.

THE DECORATION OF A CHURCH OF THE NEW JERUSALEM.

By E. Donald Robb.

WHEN the New Church was given to the world, a new day began to dawn for church architecture. The great arts of the Middle Ages—architecture, sculpture, glass painting, illuminating, church music and ceremonial—were possible only because of the intimate relationship between mediaeval religion and mediaeval life. The Church held sway in the hearts of the people and they gave liberally of their time and talents in exchange for the spiritual rewards offered them and for the very joy of doing for Mother Church. By the middle of the Seventeenth Century this zeal had burned itself out; with the corruption in the Church, the life began to disappear from church architecture, and in another hundred years we find the Wren churches in full vogue—many, indeed most of them beautiful, but cold and formal, a perfect product of an age of periwigs, courtly manners and hypocrisy, an age in which Faith and Charity were completely divorced.

Will the New Church, slowly but certainly filling our lives with new health and beauty, flow into Art and make it appear once more a living and useful servant of the Church? How can it help doing so? Art is the natural birthright of every well ordered civilization; and the artistic impulse, in one form or another, the heritage of every normal individual. In these disordered times, this appears to be far from the truth. Commerce and invention, in the Providence of the Lord, have elbowed the aesthetic into the background. It is difficult to imagine a social system in a state of perfect order, with its parts arranged in that form which is the ideal of beauty, the human form, and not have

that society acknowledge that the love of the beautiful and the desire to ultimate that love is an important attribute of the human mind. In due course of time, as the disordered elements of our civilization are restored to their correct relationship, one with another, Art will surely take its place as the Church's handmaid, and the arts of the Church will begin to revive with the influx of the New Christianity.

Although we have been regarding this as a thing of the future, it has actually been taking place for the past ninety years. What is known as the Gothic Revival began about the year 1830 in England—did not the New Church first take root there also?—with a few artists and architects who suddenly began to see beauties in the neglected remains of the Middle Ages. Whereas before this time, these same remains had been regarded as the work of barbarians, the very name "Gothic" being originally a term of contempt; they now became objects of the keenest interest, and were measured and sketched and analyzed and copied, more or less intelligently, in every corner of England and in many places in America. With the revival of Gothic architecture, came also the revival of the church ceremonial in the Oxford Movement, its cause and natural accompaniment. The development of these two closely related movements has been proceeding in a healthy manner for three generations; and today we find that many denominational churches, which a generation ago shunned the very symbol of Christianity as an architectual detail, and frowned sternly on any attempt to introduce form into Divine worship, now conduct their services in the midst of symbols and ceremony reminiscent of the Middle Ages. While this manifestation of the Gothic Revival in the so-called denominational churches, is little more than unintelligent imitation, a mere grasping at a straw to postpone for a moment or two, what all must know to be inevitable, the movement itself goes steadily on in the Church of England and in the Episcopal Church in America, our nearest of kin in the Old Church; and so the form is slowly being prepared for the infusion of the New Spirit which shall re-

store the Art with the inner meaning, that inner meaning based upon the newly revealed relation of spirit and matter.

Let us imagine ourselves seeing through the eyes of a future generation a newly constructed temple of the New Church with its decorations thought out on lines dictated by our teachings. Let us be sure to remember, however, that as the process of restoring order to our civilization has been proceeding now for some time, man's powers of observation have developed to such a state that he is able to translate natural objects into spiritual, and draw spiritual food therefrom. Not until this is possible will symbolic decoration be of any value to us. Economic changes have also been taking place in society, so that now it is no longer necessary for human beings to struggle for existence in cities whose populations are numbered in the millions—a thousand workers in a single building, and ten thousand to a single city block. The development of hydro-electric power and the improvement of transportation facilities have made possible a more even distribution of the population in cities and towns of a reasonable size. The mad rush for superfluous wealth seems to have abated, and, to use a phrase of a contemporary writer, a "true standard of comparative values" seems actually to have been established.

It is in one of these cities of moderate size that our church has been built. It crowns one of the highest points of land in the city, and its tower, although not lofty, overtops the City Hall and all the structures in the financial district. There is something about the building and the way the city seems to group itself around it, which indicates that it plays an important part in the life of the community. It does not impress one as being an architectural "design." There is no self-consciousness about it, although its parts are well arranged and its proportions beautiful. It seems more to have grown up in response to a popular demand, and to be satisfying that demand thoroughly and efficiently.

The church is cruciform and its major axis conforms quite properly to the ancient custom, lying due east and west. A radical departure from tradition has been made

in the extension of the Sanctuary to the east, to form a repository for the Word. Externally the church, although well proportioned and inspiring and of extremely substantial construction, possesses little in the way of decoration. It is chiefly when one enters its portals that the richness and beauty of the building are evident; and it is here that we see unfolded in form and color the message of the New Church. In the main entrance, loggia or "West Porch," the subject of the decoration is "The Invitation to the New Church." In the tympanum of the main doorway sits enthroned the sculptored figure of the one God, the Lord Jesus Christ, making known to the world the glad tidings of His Second Coming as related in True Christian Religion, n. 791. Surrounding the figure of the Lord are the Four Beasts of Ezekiel and the Apocalypse, arranged in the traditional manner, but now thought of as "the Word of God from its first principles to its ultimates." Apocalypse Revealed, n. 239.

In the central compartment of the stone vaulted ceiling above, directly over the tympanum of the main doorway, is seen the Angel of the Revelation, "flying in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell in the earth, and to every nation and kindred and tongue and people." In the twelve sections of the vaulted ceiling are painted half-figures of the Twelve Apostles each encircled with a scroll bearing his earthly name and surrounded with arabesques of correspondential flowers and animals. Among these arabesques and beneath the Apostles will be noticed small panels containing painted scenes representing the false doctrines which have crept into the Christian Church since the days of the Apostles. A few of these we easily recognize—"The Trinity of Three Persons," shown by three figures with similar countenances but clothed in a single mantle; "The Atonement," by God the Father, a stern faced Deity, offering His suffering Son to the world; "Infant Damnation," by an evil spirit hurrying off with a group of little children, while a priest stands at a nearby baptismal font. In the "Church's

Power to Remit Sins," a priest pronounces a blessing over the head of a youth who slyly picks his pocket. In the same way, other falsities are represented such as "Predestination," "Salvation by Faith Alone," and "Intercession of the Saints."

In similar panels above the heads of the Apostles are illustrated the true conceptions of the same doctrines. An interesting thing will be observed in the treatment of the arabesques surrounding these panels. Those of the lower order are bordered by noxious and poisonous vines with here and there toads, serpents and lizards visible among the rank foliage; and the coloring is in a low key, dark and sombre. On the other hand, the vines entwining the upper panels are the grape, the rose and the ivy; birds sing among the branches and eat of the fruit and berries, and the coloring is warm and sunny. Banding the entire porch at the level of the capital course is a carved inscription:

Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy and eat; yea come, buy wine and milk without money and without price.

Upon entering the west door, the eye is attracted immediately to the "Vision of the New Jerusalem" which is the theme of the decoration in the Sanctuary. This is properly a distant view for the present, for before we can enjoy the beauties of the Sanctuary in detail we must first traverse the length of the nave and chancel, where other things of interest have already begun to attract us. The nave and aisles of the church, where we find ourselves first after entering, may be regarded as representative of life in the world, and the decoration here is found to be inspired by that idea. First let us examine the stained glass, for windows, by their very nature, claim a first place in any decorative scheme.

It was customary in the Christian Church of the Middle Ages for various guilds, trades and professions to present to the church windows in honor of their patron saints. Here in this church we find somewhat the same idea trans-

formed and given a new significance. Whereas in the former churches these gifts were either of a votive or a propitiatory nature, now we have the windows standing for and teaching the lesson of usefulness in every day life. They tell us that our daily duties, no matter how humble or lacking what some call "dignity," are actually the means the Lord has given us to attain the heavenly character. We see here the merchant and the mechanic side by side with the theologian and the public official; the honest tradesman and the poet in the same goodly company. Working without thought of gain or profit, but inspired simply by the thought of service, these men and women remind us of the well-known passage from the "Doctrine of Charity":

> Every one who looks to the Lord and shuns evils as sins, if he sincerely, justly and faithfully performs the works that belong to his office or employment, becomes a form of charity.

And then we notice that each of the windows contains also a panel picturing an example of the Lord's usefulness among men. These lower windows cast their light more directly on our way and enable us to find points of vantage from which to observe the glass high up in the clerestory. These windows are somewhat difficult to understand without reference to our guide book. They are figure windows and when we learn the subject of each, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Samuel, David, Jonah and the rest, we know at once that these are representatives of the various faculties of the Lord's nature, and experiences of His human life.

We should now examine the great west window of five lights in which are presented to view the five Churches or grand divisions of human history, and also the spiritual history of each one of us. In the grouping of these, the New Church occupies the central light and rises slightly above the others. In the tradition of the First Christian Church, this window was usually reserved for a representation of the Last Judgment. In a different form we now have the record of the judgments pronounced upon all pre-

vious dispensations, with the assurance that the last one has occurred and is, so to speak, behind us as we face the chancel. It will repay us to examine this window in detail. We can recognize each Church or Age by a representative figure of heroic size, and under each, in a small panel, a scene associated with the consummation of that Age. Thus, reading from left to right, but omitting the central light, we have on the extreme left the figure of Adam, who, in the symbolic language of Genesis, stands for the Most Ancient Church, which came to its close in a manner most easily described by the picture of the flood shown in the small panel below. The ark of Noah appears in the distance and prepares the way for the second Church represented by Noah in the next light. The judgment of the Noachic or Ancient Church is shown by the Tower of Babel and the confusion of tongues. The Israelitish Church is represented by a woman, blindfold, bearing the tablets of the Law, and the end of the Church is portrayed in the treachery of Judas Iscariot.

In picturing the First Christian Church, the artist has chosen the Roman Catholic branch as its representative, and we see two figures in the same light—one, a pope, symbolizing the Church's claim of authority, and the other, a monk (mostly eclipsed by the first), personifying the monastic vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. In spite of the attempts at reform, evidently suggested by the monk, the love of dominion seems to have brought on the inevitable result shown below in the Fall of Babylon. The New Dispensation occupies the middle light of the window and is shown as a "woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars." Below we see the gates and towers of the New Jerusalem, with angels on the battlements.

Before proceeding to examine the decorations of the chancel, we should notice the carved capitals of the piers. These are ornamented with Biblical plants, in the order of their significance from the most external at the west to the grape, olive and pomegranate at the east end. Here and

there at convenient places on the walls, we may find incised inscriptions from the Gospels and the Writings, and occasionally a sculptured panel cut directly into the sandstone lining of the church. As we pass the door leading from the south transept to the small vestibule or south porch, we should not fail to notice the decorations of the vaulted ceiling. The subjects here chosen treat of the life and work of Emanuel Swedenborg, the Apostle of the New Church. The four compartments deal respectively with Swedenborg as a man of practical affairs, as a scientist, as a seer and as a theologian. Upon entering the chancel, our attention is first attracted to the mural painting of the Last Judgment which surmounts the Sanctuary arch. This painting is inspired by a literal reading of the Book of Revelation, ingeniously combined with Swedenborg's description of the events as he witnessed them in the year 1757. The handling of the symbolism of this difficult subject marks this as the work of a master. To the left and right of the Sanctuary arch and below the easternmost of the chancel clerestory windows, hang two splendid tapestries. These tapestries illustrate the Old and the New Testament prophesies of the Last Judgment and the New Church—on the north side, the dream of Nebuchadnezzar; on the south, the description from the Gospel of Matthew. In the six clerestory windows of the chancel are large full length figures of the angels of the Apocalypse. Beneath their feet are panels picturing the events described in the early chapters of the Book of Revelation, which immediately preceded the judgment. In the spandrels over the four chancel arches may be seen painted medallions containing scenes and events in the spiritual world taken from the Memorable Relations.

At last we have reached the Sanctuary, the artistic and spiritual climax of the church, for here we have in symbol the New Jerusalem of the Apocalypse—the City of the Lord Himself. But first let us examine the screen enclosing the Sanctuary. This, we shall find, is one of the most remarkable examples of wrought metal work it will ever

be our privilege to see. In general appearance, viewed from the nave of the church, it is rather open in its treatment, and, in fact, is scarcely noticeable, producing the effect of a shimmering veil before the objects in the Sanctuary. Upon close inspection it is found to be a marvel of intricate workmanship, full of symbolic figures, animals and vines, and sparkling with color and gold.

Let us notice, in the first place, that the screen is divided vertically into eight sections giving seven free-standing vertical members, on the top of which stand the angels of the Seven Seals. Above them, and suspended by silver chains from the arch above, are seven lamps. Directly below, in an open cornice, is a running inscription which reads: "Blessing and honor and glory and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lamb forever and ever." In a series of panels somewhat lower, we see the incidents connected with the opening of the seals, all marvelously conceived and wrought with a naiveté worthy of the middle Ages. In a second series of panels at a still lower level, we have shown us the scenes incidental to the sounding of the seven trumpets described in Chapters VIII, IX, X, XI of Revelation. Standing level with the angels of the Seals and against the Sanctuary arch on each side, are the "two witnesses." "And they shall prophesy a thousand, two hundred and three score days clothed in sackcloth."

Looking through the screen, for we may not pass beyond it, we see first the Altar of the Word in the midst of the Seven Golden Candlesticks. During Divine Worship the Word is open and exposed to the view of the congregation through the open doors of the Sanctuary screen. A section of the south Sanctuary window is treated in light, almost transparent tones, allowing the late morning sun to shine directly on the opened page. As this is the only pure white object not in semi shade in the east end of the church, the effect is almost supernatural; and the eye, attracted strongly to it, gives it immediate acknowledgment as the spiritual and artistic focal point in the church. The burnished gold

of the splendid encircling candlesticks, and the gold and white embroidery of the altar cloth help to spread this radiance throughout the Sanctuary.

It will be seen that the entire Sanctuary which enshrines the Word has been treated in rich solemn tones of deep blue and green, rich dark reds and dull golds. All stone work of the ribbed vault, the side walls with their clustered shafts, the window jambs, tracery and mullions, every square inch of surface has been overlaid with "gesso" and decorated. The three three-light windows also are in dark rich colors giving the Sanctuary an extremely solemn atmosphere and emphasizing the dazzling whiteness of the sacred page. Even the floor is toned down by the use of darker marbles—Numidians, verde antique, lapis lazuli, and Belgian black; relieved in spots by an occasional square of Istrian. Above the stone wainscoting of the Sanctuary, the branches of the Tree of Life entwine themselves in and out in intricate pattern over the flat wall surface, into the window jambs and upwards to the vault overhead. This is done in dark greens on a dull blue ground, with the fruit of the Tree in burnished gold. "And the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations." The glazing of the windows in the Sanctuary, north, east, and south is the most splendid in the church. Although the subjects chosen for this most important place require certain portions to be of great brilliancy, the colors and values are handled so skillfully that the brilliant portions are subordinated in brightness to the more important radiance from the Word on the altar below. The windows facing north and south are each glazed with representations of the New Church; that to the north with Swedenborg's vision of the magnificent temple, over the gate of which was inscribed the words, "Nunc licet" (True Christian Religion, n. 508); that to the south with John's vision in Patmos.

And I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. And I, John, saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down

from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.

And in the great east window:

Behold a throne was set in heaven, and one sat on the throne. And he that sat was to look upon like a jasper and a sardine stone; and there was a rainbow about the throne, in sight like unto an emerald. And round about the throne were four and twenty seats; and upon the seats I saw four and twenty elders sitting, clothed in white raiment; and they had on their heads crowns of gold. And in the midst of the throne, and round about the throne, were four beasts full of eyes before and behind.

—and they rest not day and night saying "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was and is and is to come.

E. Donald Robb.

"PURPOSE AND TRANSCENDENTALISM." *

By the Rev. Lewis F. Hite.

THIS book is an attempt to expound Swedenborg's "outstanding philosophical doctrines and certain of their applications in various departments of modern thought."

The attempt to expound Swedenborg's doctrines with a fair degree of systematic completeness is a task of no ordinary kind. A goodly number of the leading minds of the Church and some of the best minds of scholarship at large have devoted the gifts of their ripest years to various features of this exposition; but it must be said that hitherto we have had no signal achievement of the kind so imperatively needed.

A fresh attempt, therefore, which comes to us well accredited, arouses unusual expectations and receives a lively welcome. The wide range of the author's literary activity, his scientific attainments and his multifarious reading, inspire a certain degree of confidence in his qualifications for the proposed task. The Table of Contents sets before us an inviting array of topics, and the spirit and purpose of the Essay are well stated in the Preface.

The title "Purpose and Transcendentalism" lifts us at once to the philosophical level; and the sub-title "An Exposition of Swedenborg's Philosophical Doctrines in Relation to Modern Thought" directs our attention to Swedenborg's doctrine of End, Cause, and Effect. The term "Transcendentalism" directs us to Kant and the philosophical episode

* *Purpose and Transcendentalism:* An Exposition of Swedenborg's Philosophical Doctrines in Relation to Modern Thought. By H. Stanley Redgrove, B.Sc. (London), F.C.S. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1920. 170 pp., 8vo. Cloth, $2.00.

which he helped to initiate; it also suggests the philosophical substance and form of the book.

We are reminded of C. A. Tulk's disturbing attempt to put Swedenborg's philosophy into the Idealistic mold. The fact is, however, as a close reading discovers, the word "Transcendentalism" does not occur in the subsequent text. The words Transcendent and Transcendental do occur at one point to mark the distinction between Pantheism and Theism, but few traces of the Philosophy of Transcendentalism appear anywhere throughout the book. In fact, the author is not so much concerned with the underlying philosophy of Swedenborg's system of doctrine, as he is to sketch some of these doctrines and to present in connection therewith some of the doctrines of Modern Physics and Biology.

The author maintains from first to last that certain of Swedenborg's philosophical doctrines are of the greatest importance to the thought and science of today. He reminds us that "Many of the greatest minds of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries . . . were not a little indebted to Swedenborg, and through their writings some of Swedenborg's ideas have filtered down into current thought"; he cites as testimony to Swedenborg's greatness the International Swedenborg Congress in London, in 1910; he calls attention to the tribute of scientists of high standing in pointing out "Swedenborg's extraordinary anticipation of certain modern scientific theories." He also refers to the significant fact that the "Everyman" library has published three of Swedenborg's works, indicating a demand on the part of the general public. Notwithstanding these facts, however, he thinks that "Swedenborg's works are neither as widely read nor as much appreciated as they ought to be." The reason which he gives for this lack of due attention is characteristic, and affords the key to the author's point of view and position, and to the treatment throughout.

There have been many surmises and opinions as to why Swedenborg is not taken at his true worth by the reading

public. The author seems oblivious to the obstinate fact that Swedenborg is hard reading, which calls for a high order of mental and moral equipment; he also neglects the influence of sectarian prejudice and animosity, the result of systematic and long-continued propaganda; but concentrates his hostile attention upon the, to him, vicious consequences of the attitude towards Swedenborg and his writings which he attributes to a certain class of Swedenborgians. It is true, he thinks, that the general neglect of Swedenborg is due in part to the "wrong sense of values which afflicts modern society, on the one hand"; and, on the other, to an idealism gone bad and the disinclination of so many minds to think seriously. But his special contention is that, "apart from these factors, there is another peculiar to Swedenborg." He then takes up Swedenborg's extraordinary claim that his spiritual sight was opened by the Lord, and that he was for years in constant communication with spirits; and the contention is that the attitude towards this claim and the authority consequent upon it, on the part of blind disciples, is chiefly and especially responsible for the mischief to Swedenborg's popularity. Nowadays, of course, thanks to the "patient and laborious work of the Society for Psychical Research, such a claim can be calmly received": it neither shakes our "faith in Swedenborg as a careful and reliable observer, and an astute and brilliant thinker," nor, on the other hand, does it "add anything to his authority." "But to many minds, both of his own day and of later times, this claim means one of two things: either that Swedenborg was mad or that he was an inspired prophet of God." So it has come about that "Swedenborg's works are treated nearly always as either the ravings of a demented mind or the authoritative utterances of divine inspiration."

Here we arrive at the point of the author's critical attitude, critical both of Swedenborg and his followers. He grants that there are some passages in Swedenborg's writings that support the contention that it was his own view that his writings were of divine authority, but insists that

full weight should be given the clear and uniform teaching "that *all* that is true and good is given to man by influx from God, i.e., by divine inspiration." The argument that follows upon this appeal to Swedenborg's position is as characteristic as it is fallacious. "This doctrine," he proceeds, "robs the claim to inspiration of its character of uniqueness. In its light, we may say: Truth is the test of inspiration; not inspiration of truth. Reason remains the supreme authority." This is so specious and makes such a direct and strong appeal to the rationalism of the uneducated mind, that we must pause to examine it.

The author by an undiscriminating identification of "influx" and "inspiration" does indeed rob inspiration of its character of uniqueness, but in so doing he at the same time obliterates all distinction between religious and mere animal life. For, since all life is from God, no distinction can be made on this ground between plant, animal, man, and angel. The distinction to be made is that inspiration, whether intellectual, artistic, or religious, is a higher mode or degree of influx, suited to a higher grade of organism. The divine influx in the case of a highly educated man is on a different level from that of a blade of grass or a silk worm. On the same principle, the inspiration of Plato, Shakespeare, or Swedenborg was a different thing in each case. It is true, but quite irrelevant, to say that they were all inspired; it would be just as true, but very much more to the point, to say that in each case the inspiration was unique and even supreme. It would therefore be entirely reasonable to maintain, as his most enlightened readers do, that Swedenborg's inspiration was in very truth unique and supreme in the field of religious experience. This kind and degree of inspiration is of itself the highest and surest guarantee of truth. Truth strictly speaking is the correct mode of perceiving, conceiving, thinking, and speaking; it is correspondence between thought and fact; it is the property of valid judgment. The attainment of truth, therefore, is the function of a suitably equipped organism, capable of receiving and expressing the divine light; and

when in this light the nature of the divine itself and man's inner relation to the divine are directly and clearly seen, we have a level of influx which is religious inspiration proper. It may well be said that truth is the test of inspiration, especially of the false pretense of inspiration, but it is even more important as well as true to say that inspiration is the test of truth.

It is curious and at the same time prophetic that here at the very outset of his discussion, in his thoughtful and well written Preface, the author completely ignores the very doctrine that the book was intended to expound and apply. A little attention to the fact that there are degrees of influx and that there are various kinds as well as degrees of inspiration, would have prevented the confusion that usually results from taking abstract conceptions without qualification and due discrimination. The same lack of discrimination and the same appeal to crude rationalism is shown in the statement and conclusion that "Reason remains supreme authority." It is true, of course, that reason is an indispensable factor in both a practical and theoretical life; but the well-known fact is that instinct and insight play a much larger part in all human life than does reason. Indeed, without true instinct and insight reason is wholly impotent when not vicious. Psychologically, reason depends upon intuition; in other words, the terms are, and must be, seen, before their relations can be discovered and determined. Reason is serviceable to correct both instinct and intuition when they are at fault, but it is powerless either to give or to assure true instinct and intuition; these depend upon the quality, the equipment, and the training of the recipient and percipient organism. So it must be said that all final authority transcends the authority of reason; and inspiration when it is a fact is final authority, because it is inspiration that gives truth, especially inspiration at the highest level, or in the highest degree.

It is hard to take the author's discussion at this point (Preface, p. IX) seriously; but as we proceed, we soon discover the cause of his mental blindness. It is the ques-

tion of Swedenborg's authority with a certain class of offensive disciple that inflames and blinds him. He is not thinking of "that extreme section of his followers who would replace the edifice of modern science, . . . by the brilliant but nevertheless faulty and, of course, very incomplete, speculations of Swedenborg." Their attitude is too absurd to need criticism. The real offenders, fit objects of wrath and condemnation, are those who "claim divine authority for the mature philosophical and theological works written during the latter part of his life." Here, then, we have, it seems, the real cause of the aversion of the public mind. "I cannot suggest anything better calculated than this [claim of authority] to repel the average level headed man from a study of Swedenborg's works."

The tone of assured superiority both to Swedenborg and his disciples with which the above language is charged, might be passed over in silence or with a cheap excuse, if it were merely a personal matter of the author's peculiar view; but the serious student of Swedenborg is too often offended by such superior airs. Too many of the would be expounders of Swedenborg, especially those who have a scientific and philosophical reputation to guard, are prone to assure their professional integrity by displaying a condescending superiority. Kant was a signal instance of this, but, so much the worse, he was not alone. His succesors and imitators in this trait have been conspicuous and mischievous both within and without the ranks of professed New Churchmen. The attitude of the former is due, it is safe to assume, to a lack of genuine and cultivated intellectual interest, but more flagrantly to embittered and narrow-minded sectarianism, sectarianism in discipleship, and even worse sectarianism in separating themselves from other classes of disciples who are to be despised and punished at every turn. Anxiety to punish "blind followers" who push the claim of authority to the extreme is itself a blinding passion with these superior critics, who neglect the real problem which an adequate interpretation of Swedenborg's doctrines presses upon the liberally educated mind.

Mr. Redgrove is a case in point. He is so obsessed with the idea of demolishing the exaggerated claim of authority for Swedenborg's writings that he makes this claim the chief impediment to public appreciation, while he himself fails at just the point where the public is left without a guide, that is, the point where Swedenborg's full and exact meaning becomes a paramount question. It may or may not be true that some disciples have exaggerated ideas of Swedenborg's authority; and it may be true that the question of his authority is one of both general and special importance, but there is little reason to think that this question disturbs the public, or any considerable body of readers. On the contrary, it may be safely assumed that no character of Swedenborg's writings, not even the character of truth, would so commend them to public acceptance as the claim or the assurance of final religious authority. It is the simple fact that Swedenborg's character, his unique experience, and the body of his writings do constitute him an authority of unexampled type and degree. It is mere blindness, intellectual immaturity, that refuses to recognize this fact; the vain and ignorant assertion that reason is the supreme authority is mere self-exaltation. Such an assertion is as harmless as it is true when Reason is taken in the absolute sense, as the equivalent of the Divine Wisdom, but in this sense, so far as man is concerned, it is identical with divine inspiration. The individual reason of any particular man is very far from being the supreme authority even for himself, not to say for the community. The reason of the individual man is the creature of circumstances and especially of education, training, cultivation. It is never at any given stage or moment the supreme authority, though it is in any given situation serviceable as an advisor, guide, and protector; its authority always calls for more relations, more experience.

This is not the occasion to discuss at length either the nature of authority in general or the nature of Swedenborg's authority in particular; nor would it be pertinent to enter systematically upon the question of the authority of

reason. The task of expounding Swedenborg is confronted with a more insistent and a more immediately important problem, that of seeing the truth of what he says. What is it after all that so powerfully constrains Mr. Redgrove to direct his hostile fire upon Swedenborg's authority and upon those who accept and proclaim it? Bearing in mind that Swedenborg's authority, whatever its limits, is a fact, and that the grounds upon which the attack is made are fallacious, we must look for some more compelling motive. Passages already quoted reveal a tone of superiority, the assertion of full competence to pass judgment, to concede and at the same time limit the greatness of his author. A morbid caution not to commit himself to unqualified acceptance or admiration, but to maintain an independent superiority, is pervasive. It is under the compulsion of this attitude that he goes so far out of his way as to declare: "I do not think that Swedenborg was infallible." What should we say of an expounder of Plato who stopped in the midst of his exposition to declare that he did not think Plato infallible. The disciple, the true disciple, would be too much interested in discovering and setting forth Plato's meaning to turn aside for such an impertinent remark. It is an intellectual disease—perhaps what Swedenborg calls "Pride of self-derived intelligence"—with a considerable number of his expounders that they are over much concerned to assert their independence and superiority, and to set themselves off from and over the class of avowed disciples and unqualified admirers. The unmitigated arrogance of this attitude is not only foreign to liberal scholarship; it is overweening sectarianism, and forbids any genuine pursuit of Swedenborg's meaning. In their insecure and superficial eminence, these self-appointed over-Lords look to the sect of "Scientists" and to the verdicts of "Science" for strength and approbation. They forget that they have a task that invites the full exertion of all their powers, and which they blindly bring into discredit, the task of fair and full interpretation.

If our author had contented himself with a Preface in line with the moderate statement:

> Swedenborg's philosophy deserves to be studied in the cool, critical spirit that is given to the study of the works of any other eminent philosopher, and it is in that spirit that I attempt in this volume to expound his outstanding philosophical doctrines and certain of their applications in various departments of modern thought,

he would have inspired a good degree of confidence, instead of arousing well grounded distrust. He would have omitted: "I think he made statements (like every one else, however great) open to criticism and capable of contradiction." Why parade one's all comprehensive wisdom, one's never-failing omniscience? Why indulge in *à priori* fault-finding? If there were specific instances of such "statements," conspicuous in number and importance, it might be the duty and convenience of the critic to cover them all with a general statement, but this would be a very different thing from *à priori* assertion. The affirmative purpose of philosophic interest would have been sufficiently expressed by the well chosen language:

> I consider him one of the world's master-minds. I think that a critical study of his works yields much priceless philosophical gold, and that his philosophical doctrines (or some of them) are of the greatest importance in their applications to the thought of today and are much needed by that thought. And it is because I think this that I have written this book.

It would remain then only to fulfil the proposed task of exhibiting the philosophical gold and the much needed applications. How this task has been performed we have now to ascertain.

The book, as the well constructed Table of Contents shows, contains six chapters. The first two alone treat of Swedenborg's doctrines specifically; Chapter I, of The Doctrine of Degrees, and Chapter II, of The Doctrine of Correspondence. Chapter III, under the head of Ontology, makes incidental reference to the Doctrine of Influx. The remaining chapters, under the head of "Physics," "Biol-

ogy," and "Ethics" respectively, treat almost exclusively of doctrines and problems of modern science and philosophy. It is quite apart from the purpose of this review to follow the author into the discussions of these later chapters; we are directly concerned with the applications he makes, in such discussions, of Swedenborg's doctrines. But first we turn to the specific treatment of the doctrines themselves, namely, the Doctrine of Degrees and the Doctrine of Correspondences.

The author went straight to the mark when he chose Purpose as the essential theme of Swedenborg's philosophy, and the Doctrine of Degrees as the easiest approach to the fundamental principles of the philosophy. Swedenborg's philosophy is distinctively and consistently a philosophy of Creation. "The act of creation is represented every moment in our own minds." (Economy of the Animal Kingdom, Part II, n. 365.) The process of forming and carrying out a purpose exhibits the whole nature of man as a self-conscious agent, as knower and doer. In forming a purpose, we select a given present quality of affection as an end to be realized under conditions of more complete enjoyment and satisfaction. The affection in thus becoming object of thought is projected into the body of our ideas which furnish the conditions of embodiment and satisfaction; at this stage it becomes the "End," and is realized in the complete set of conditions furnished. The appropriate set of ideas is furnished by the activity of thought, and in this function thought is termed the Cause. Among the conditions needed for the embodiment of the affection, the realization of the End, are bodily states and activities; these when produced are termed the Effect. The philosophy of Purpose, therefore, is the philosophy of End, Cause, and Effect; and end, cause, and effect constitute Swedenborg's standing instance of three Discrete Degrees. This whole process, when examined more deeply, is seen to be in very truth a process of creation, out of love, by wisdom, in use.

The author proceeds in a more concrete fashion. He begins with Motive as the ground for the explanation of

man's conduct. He distinguishes three points of view, three levels of observation, when it is proposed to explain a man's action: first, his external behavior as a body among other physical bodies; second, the psychological processes involved; and third, the motive. The first two add to our knowledge of the behavior, but only the motive furnishes the satisfactory explanation. "These three may be termed respectively phenomenon, efficient cause, and final cause." They answer the questions, What? How? Why? They are "in Swedenborg's terminology, effect, cause, and end." By a sudden and violent transition, the author passes to the general statement that "Behind every natural phenomenon, then, we must postulate an end and a cause." This enables him to pass to the application of the doctrine to the universe in the form: God as End, Spirit as Cause, and Nature as Effect. This, of course, is quite in accordance with Swedenborg's formula; but it leaves an immense deal of mediation to be done to make it intelligible. The argument by which the author attempts to justify this enormous leap from Man to Nature invites a close examination, as it exhibits quite fully his habit of mind and the procedure of the whole book. At this point the precise significance of the word "Transcendentalism" in the title comes to view. Nature is taken to be "a series of phenomena or effects." This is Kantian language, but the immediately subsequent treatment is Berkelian, without Berkeley's acute and intimate rational insight. In spite of the endless discussions of modern philosophy, the controversy still rages between the Idealists and the Realists as to the nature of physical objects. It is obvious, therefore, that the word phenomena, and especially the word effects, are mere question-begging epithets. It is, of course, true that Man's nature is "closely interwoven with that of the Universe," but it does not follow that we may "rightly regard the Universe as an ideal construction of the perceiving mind." Nor does the author himself seriously and consistently hold to this; for although, "each individual's universe is an ideal product of that individual's intelligence," nevertheless, everyone "re-

alizes that there is an element in experience that is not self-generated." Then follows the familiar piece of Berkelianism as to the natural order of our ideas, with the conclusion that Nature is given to us for the most part quite independent of our idealistic construction. "Thus, the definite orders and sequences in our percepts, that is, the so-called 'Laws of Nature,' constitute a world not of our creating." (p. 6.) This conclusion assures us, then, that the objects of nature and their behavior are not mere phenomena, nor, consequently, are they effects.

The outcome is baffling; but there is another line of argument which the author seems to conduct with more success, and which lies nearer to the doctrine of Swedenborg. It begins with the thesis that there is in experience a common element, "which, to some extent at least, is, or may be, shared by all minds." So likewise, there is a community of nature in the phyical universe which gives it oneness and harmony, and is the basis of the scientific principle, or postulate, of the "uniformity of Nature." Then comes another of those frequent and characteristic, not to say measureless, leaps to the conclusion; "that Nature is the product, not of many wills, but of *one* Will or Love, operating by means of *one* Intelligence or Wisdom." Herewith we are landed in the midst of Swedenborg's phraseology, however, precipitate the leap. Nevertheless, we must try to do full justice to the author's procedure, and this requires due retrospect and careful rereading.

We recall the transition from the analysis of purpose to the doctrine of End, Cause, and Effect. This is quite in accordance with Swedenborg and fundamental to any adequate interpretation of his doctrine.. We noted at this point the abrupt transition from Man to Nature, and followed the author's idealistic philosophizing to its self-contradictory conclusion. We have now to follow the transition from man to God, from man as the individual creator of his own acts and phenomenal world to God the one Creator of the Universe. Quite in accordance with Swedenborg's doctrine, the author proceeds to extend the

notion of man. He reminds us that man was declared by philosophers of remote antiquity to be a microcosm, "a universe in miniature." He goes on to say that "Swedenborg restated this doctrine by designating the universe 'The Grand Man.'" Hereupon, we are enjoined to be careful to understand aright what Swedenborg means by such terms as "man" and "the human form." Primarily, "it is will or love that constitutes the man"; a man's intelligence is related to that love or will as cause to end, and from his intelligence as cause flow his actions as effects. In other words, man is of the form of love, intelligence, and action. If, then, man is a microcosm, and if the macrocosm is "The Grand Man," the universe is of the form Will, Intelligence, and Action, or Love, Wisdom, and Operation; in other words, of the form of End, Cause, and Effect. There is a good deal of confusion in the author's way of putting the argument, but in the main the result agrees with Swedenborg's doctrine. It is not fair to Swedenborg to let the argument stand in this mere outline, and it must be said that the author has done next to nothing towards making his doctrine intelligible. But this is not the place to develop philosophical theses. Let us pass to the treatment of the Doctrine of Degrees.

The author has proposed as his task "An Exposition of Swedenborg's Philosophical Doctrines in Relation to Modern Thought," and he opens his exposition with the Doctrine of Degrees. We have a right to expect some fresh attempt at exposition.

It is an inviting opportunity to review some of the many attempts that have been made by prominent expounders of Swedenborg to present his Doctrine of Degrees. It was a simple consequence of its recognized importance that readers and students from the first should labor with earnestness and zeal to give a fitting account of this doctrine. But in all cases, the accounts have been characterized rather by the "language of appreciation," than by scientific and philosophical exposition. Among the many and varied attempts, we may select as in some respects

distinctive two which will serve as specimens of the most successful. Dr. N. C. Burnham's "Discrete Degrees" is monumental as a diagrammatic and mechanical treatment; it is a veritable mine of collected statements with little intelligent effort at interpretation. Dr. Frank Sewall's "The New Metaphysics," on the other hand, is a zealous and ambitious attempt at metaphysical interpretation and construction. Dr. Sewall appropriately employs the sub-title "The Law of End, Cause, and Effect," and the book is an interesting and partially successful exposition of the Law. But like Dr. Burnham's book and other less systematic efforts, it lacks thoroughgoing intellectual interest; it aims at literary effect rather than philosophical enlightenment. Like all affirmative expositions of Swedenborg's doctrines, and happily free from the vices of negative critics, it is pervaded with a dogmatic *à priorism* which weakens, when it does not defeat, its best efforts. Nevertheless, it is fair, as well as instructive, that Dr. Sewall should speak for himself at his best. After a carefully worked out statement of the Doctrine of Discrete Degrees, especially in the form of End, Cause, and Effect, he passes to its application to the universe and to the process of Creation. He begins with the formula: All being implies three distinct elements; these are End, Cause, and Effect. There are several variations of the formula: Any object by the very fact of its being presents to us these three constituents; whatever *is,* is *end, cause,* and *effect;* everything that exists implies its own cause and its own end. Passing over the vicious infinite regress which these formulae present, we come to their application. The physical universe exists; but if it exists it must exist from a cause, and this from its end. Then we ask what is this cause and this end? The answer is: "The natural or material world is the effect of which the spiritual world is the cause, and God is the end."

All this, of course, is mere begging the question, and is a characteristic piece of *à priori* dogmatism. The fallacy of infinite regress is at once exposed by asking of the cause, or end, does it exist? If, for example, the End exists, then

it exists from its cause and this from its end, and so on *ad infinitum*. In short, the argument applies to the spiritual world, and to God Himself, as well as to the physical world; and so becomes vicious and useless.

Dr. Sewall is at his best in the following:

> God as such, namely, in the Divine Ends of His Love operating *through* His Wisdom *in* His Divine Uses, is inmostly present in the spiritual world as the world of causes, and through that world in the world of nature as the world of effects. The material world regarded in itself and as material has its three discrete degrees in the trine of the sun, atmospheres, and earth, the sun being as the end, containing as it does all the forces and materials of the physical world; the atmospheres, considered in their three degrees of aura, ether, and air, are as the means or causes by which the ends or primary endeavors of the sun's elements become active forces; the earth is the ultimate or effect in which the endeavors of the sun and the forces of the atmospheres become fixed and determined in natural uses. (p. 49.)

Many critical questions arise in a close reading of this interesting and truly significant passage, but we delay with the simple remark that it states in an impressive summary the finished outcome of Dr. Sewall's essay.

We may now ask, does Mr. Redgrove carry us beyond this treatment, and make the doctrine of degrees more intelligible and its applications more significant, We have already followed him to the conclusion, which is really a presupposition with him, that the Universe is a larger Man, constituted like the individual man, of will, intelligence, and action; and so is of the form of End, Cause, and Effect. These he rightly affirms to be what Swedenborg terms "Discrete Degrees"; and we are forthwith interested to know what is meant by characterizing the terms of the familiar series end, cause, and effect as Discrete Degrees. The author proceeds to develop the distinction "of fundamental importance" in Swedenborg's philosophy and "of very real value to modern thought" between discrete and continuous degrees. Continuous degrees have no sharp lines of division, they merge into each other, as small into large, light into heavy, etc.; moreover, "two continuous

degrees of the same series cannot co-exist." Discrete degrees, on the other hand, do not merge into each other, they are perfectly distinct, they always co-exist; "for the end does not exist otherwise than in the cause, nor does the cause exist otherwise than in the effect." And quoting Swedenborg, "Degrees of ascent are homogeneous, one being successively derived from another, like end, cause, and effect." (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 139.) Then follows all he says significantly about the nature of discrete degrees:

> Desire, thought, and action in man constitute one of the best examples of what are meant by discrete degrees. Desire does not merge into thought as small into large, nor does thought merge into action as cold into hot. . . . But for desire to exist as an end it must exist in thought, and for thought to exist as a cause, ministering to that end, it must exist, that is, be manifested, in some form of outward action.

This is unquestionably true to Swedenborg's formula, and the truth of the formula we take for granted; but our immediate and special interest just now is to see, for ourselves in the light of our mind, the truth of it. It would seem that the author had this question in some form before him when he turns aside to discuss the meaning of "without" and "within" and the meaning "cause," and we must try to do justice to this discussion. The point of the discussion is to distinguish between the world "within" and the world "without," between the world of mind and the world of Nature. The world "without" is spatial, the world "within" is non-spatial. So "Cause as Source" is in the world of mind; while "Cause as Occasion" is in the world of Nature. In neither discussion is there any intellectual appreciation of the problems at issue. All that we find is an attempt to restate with dogmatic simplicity some of the prominent features of Swedenborg's space and time doctrine, and of his doctrine of Cause. The problem is one of extreme metaphysical difficulty, and requires for its solution a thoroughgoing revision and reconstruction of some of our most familiar conceptions and habits of

thought. As to the distinction between "within" and "without," it is first of all to be observed that as correlatives they are both equally spatial; to "exist out of" space is precisely as much a spatial property as to "exist in space." It is equally inappropriate to say that thought and desire are in space or that they exist out of space. The thing to recognize is that within and without are space figures when applied to mental states, which are inveterate in our habits of speech and thought. The author seems to be trying to meet the difficulty when he makes "within" refer to the will, operating only in thought; and "without" to the "region where will, flowing through thought into action," meets with the opposition of other wills and the "laws of Nature." Here, the author thinks, the terms have "no spatial reference," but it is obvious that the whole situation is conceived and described in space terms; the relations between will, thought, and act are represented in space terms. This form of representation may or may not be necessary, but it is certainly convenient; it may be extremely difficult to avoid; but that is another matter. What the situation requires is to recognize the fact. We should not be imposed upon by the usual self-conceited and superior appropriation of Swedenborg's caution that "we must free our minds from . . . ideas of space and time if we would enter into a real understanding of the problems of philosophy." The author has really not taken the first step towards freeing his thinking from space and time ideas. In this respect he is in the same predicament with other self-deluded expounders of Swedenborg. It is not so much the difficulty of thinking spiritually but the lack of habit that Swedenborg has in mind when he gives us this injunction, not to confound our spiritual thinking with ideas of space and time. All we have to do is to think in terms of quality and not in terms of quantity. Here the fundamental relations are similarity and dissimilarity, likeness and unlikeness, which are just as familiar as the relations of far and near; and, curiously enough, these relations

are said to "Correspond" to each other, so that in the spiritual world likeness makes nearness.

It sounds very specious to say that the "without" is spatial and is the domain of nature and action, while the "within" is that "of imagination and will." This prepares for another of those unmeasured leaps which we have had occasion to comment on as characteristic of the author's procedure. If these leaps were not so much the rule with writers on Swedenborg's philosophy, it might be unkind to reiterate our criticism; but we want to stigmatize this vicious habit.

After all, what are we to do with the distinction between "the within" and "the without"? Let us take a specific instance. Is the blue sky a part of Nature or is it a part of the mind? Is it "within" or "without"? In the face of this question, we see how idle the author's distinctions and classifications are. Or we may ask, does the blue sky exist? If so, then, according to the formula, it exists from a cause, and this from its end; it is therefore an effect. Or again, the blue sky is a phenomenon, one of the innumerable phenomena of Nature. Now, as a matter of fact, or of psychological analysis, there is no such thing, "external object," as "the blue sky": in other words it does not exist in the sense of being a natural object, an object in the physical world. Physical objects are such that, actually or conceivably, we can approach them and handle them in various ways; but we can no more approach and handle the blue sky than we can get a pot of gold at the foot of a rainbow. Here we are landed in the intricacies and intimacies of psychophysical and metaphysical analysis. We introduce the word "appearance", and make the distinction between "appearance" and "reality". We undertake to say that the blue sky is appearance, while the green tree is fact. Or we may go farther and make, with Kant, the distinction between the tree as visual object and tree as material body, "thing-in-itself." But now we find ourselves in the predicament of Locke and Berkeley, and search in vain for a mode of existence of the tree which is not either a sense

quality or a thought product; and we may mark this distinction, if we please, by the terms *Phenomenon* and *Noumenon*. But, after all, in what sense is the blue sky more appearance or less real than the oak tree? At this point, we may make the distinction between psychical reality and practical, metaphysical, or actual reality. In the last analysis, all these distinctions vanish before the inexorable demands of the problem of knowledge. The oak tree as well as the blue sky is inevitably knowledge. To say, then, that the blue sky exists, that it is a phenomenon, that it is psychical reality, part of nature or part of mind, that it is "within" or "without", that it is "effect"; all these are nothing but different ways of asking questions about the nature of knowledge. Not until we have solved the problem of knowledge, can we make any of these assertions, except as conventional and convenient forms of speech. Short of this, they are mere question begging epithets.

The problem of knowledge may be approached from any number of points of view, but the simplest and most direct, perhaps, is to ask in the case of the blue sky: what is the difference between "within" and "without"? As a little psychological analysis and history will show, the blue sky is both "within" and "without", and neither "within" nor "without"; it is within the realm of space, but without the space occupied by the beholder's body; it is neither within nor without the mind. The distinction between within and without is a space distinction, and is not applicable to the mind; our affections and thoughts, our emotions, desires, and ideas, are qualities and forms, not bodies; they do not occupy space, nor do they have space relations. The original case of "outness" is a case of "otherness", and is best presented by taking for observation and analysis the nature and functions of love. Love according to Swedenborg, and the deepest philosophical insight, is the fundamental fact of the Universe; all analysis should lead to it, and all construction begin from it. This is one way of saying that Love is the Creator of the world. Man is a product and a form of love; all of man's faculties and

activities are functions of love, and among these knowledge, intelligence, and wisdom are the functions which are the object of our immediate interest and inquiry.

If, then, we want to exhaust our knowledge of the blue sky, we must ask what is its relation to love; what function of love is it? In other words, how does love create it? Deep reflection upon the inner movements of our conscious life brings to light this primitive fact: some quality of love, "affection of love" Swedenborg calls it, comes to consciousness and becomes a "focus of consciousness", an immediate object of attention. Forthwith, an amazing series of transformations and developments take place under our gaze. By the very fact of being object of attention this "affection of love" is distinguished, "separated out," set apart, from the whole love, and the relation generic and specific arises. Thus the affection gets the character of being "other" than the generic, parent love. As other it nevertheless represents in quality and function the whole nature of the love from which it springs. To state the case more fully, the whole love sees itself projected, represented, and realized within the limits of this affection. In this sense it is truly an affection of the love, and is at the same time an object to which the whole love can give the fullness of its nature. There are countless such affections of love, in fact the created universe is an immense system of such affections. In adequate terms, it may be said that Love is an Infinite, Self-projective, Self-representative, Self-realizing Function or System. The created universe, then, is, strictly speaking, a vast, many-faced Image of the Creative Love; and man in particular is the crowning instance of an affection of love, and is at the same time both image and likeness. Indeed, man is himself an instance of creative love operating as an affection of the Supreme Love which is God. Therefore, in studying the functions of man as creative love we are enabled to approximate a knowledge of universal creation.

Let us now return to the original situation. We saw that when the love becomes conscious of one of its affections it

distinguishes that affection from itself as other and as its object. We have described this process by the term "Self-projection," and, of course, this is applying a space figure to a non-spatial situation; but apart from such figures the poverty of our language and our habits of thought are such that description of spiritual changes would be too meagre and to a considerable extent unintelligible. However, we may proceed deliberately, and measure our steps as we go. In the case before us, the word "other" is a purely qualitative term and expresses a purely qualitative relation; while the word "object" implies the process of separation and projection, and the relation of distance. But in this situation, the character of "otherness is primitive, while that of "objectiveness" is derived and figurative. Here we have the original situation where figurative language and space relations come into being. The quality, affection, feeling, emotion, state of the love is not outside the love in the spatial sense; and yet it is distinguished, selected, set apart as other, and thus objectified by the love. This is the primitive case of the connection between *otherness* and *outness;* and the relation when developed at large turns out to be the "Relation of Correspondence"; and so "otherness" is the original case of "outness."

The distinction between "within" and "without," therefore, in the case of the blue sky is not primarily a space distinction but is the distinction between the whole man as an organized body of love and one of his affections made object of attention and mental handling. The blue of the sky is neither "in" the sky, eye, brain, nor in the mind; the blue of the sky is no "where"; it is a specific quality "of" the mind, the man. We forbear to follow out the cosmological and theological developments of this situation; but we are in a position to assert that the blue sky is a quality, state, function, of Love.

These observations are intended to show how far the author's treatment falls short of his purpose "to expound" some of Swedenborg's doctrines. His treatment of the "Doctrine of Degrees" is limited to a simple statement of

the formula and citing a few applications. The real problem presented by the doctrine is not even hinted at, namely, the meaning of *discreteness*. The doctrines of Correspondence and Influx are still less adequately treated.

Nevertheless the book is well written and is on the whole smooth and agreeable reading. We recommend it as an attractive introduction, not an "exposition," of Swedenborg's doctrines in a very diffuse context of modern thought. It is disappointing in what it fails to do rather than in what it actually accomplishes. It disappoints reasonable expectations aroused by the author's position and professions. We have criticized it in the context of similar undertakings with the hope of stimulating more serious and systematic efforts to expound Swedenborg's philosophy in a measure commensurate with its importance.

LEWIS F. HITE.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

THE CONVENTION OF 1921.

DESPITE the sense of the loss of our late leader from physical presence with us, the Convention of 1921 was a distinctly hopeful and happy one. Perhaps that is as sure a tribute to his persisting influence as could be given him, and a tribute to the optimistic tone of all his work for us. But the meetings were happy for the reason, too, that they were given unusually much to fraternizing. They were easy in manner, and even not markedly purposeful. The tendency, legitimate and always strong, to make Convention a social occasion, when those whom the cause of a New Church has brought together might cultivate acquaintance, had good scope at these meetings. Knots of people seemed always to be chatting in the Vestry, which was purposely kept free from meetings to allow for such friendly exchanges. Many of the League delegates were sociably housed together in the halls of the Waltham School for Girls. The excursion, under the auspices of the young people, was joined in by everybody. At the reception of Monday evening the whole evening was given to recreation, unlike last year. Doubtless it had not a little to do with the sociable aspects of the meetings that they were held in the house of worship of the Boston Society, which has family ties with so many of our societies. It was a fraternizing Convention.

Indeed, if the one hundredth session of Convention is to stand out at all among Conventions, probably it will be more on account of things done away from it and reported to it, or transactions arising out of it, than because of anything done at it. A chronicler of the meetings might quite truthfully feel that they were not meetings at which much was done, or much of weight, or significance. The amendments finally adopted to

the Constitution, providing for fresh membership in the General Council periodically, had some progressive significance. Yet by that way of securing a good end, Convention agreed to bind itself at fixed times (which may be bad times) to change the membership of the body which governs in the interval of Convention meetings. It would have been much simpler for the Nominating Committee each year to bring in new names as well as old, and for Convention to study its choices then, and to make them to suit the need. The amendment means that the Convention, in its own opinion, had not the spirit or the resolution surely to pursue the simpler way. It compels a change quadrennially, and may do so inopportunely. The gain is a gain, however. There was the thoroughly inspiring report from the management of the campaign to endow Urbana more generously. Mrs. Buell was listened to with the greatest interest and pleasure. She brought out eloquently the significance for our solidarity of the campaign's success. But what was reported, great cause for congratulation that it was, still was nothing done at the Convention of 1921 or by it. Nor is the formal launching of the effort to increase the endowment of the Theological School to be put down as the peculiar deed of this Convention. The sentiment has been growing over several Conventions, and the movement was definitely inspired at the Convention in New York. Since then the General Council has had the matter in its decision. Now the campaign will be actively begun for an increase in the School's endowment, the Directors of the School hope, of $200,000. There is no religious body whose progress is so closely tied up with the competent deliverance of its message as is the cause of the New Church. Our School has an equipment in building and funds, a curriculum and a teaching corps little extended beyond what they have been for years, when during those years the whole problem of maintaining the spiritual life of men, and in particular the problem of the ministry of the New Church, have become more and more difficult and many-sided. What is done *for the School* now will be pretty largely what is done *by the Church* in the next thirty, forty or fifty years. But if only to impress its mem-

bership with this fact, Convention did nothing, and it remains for the campaign to do it. There was the change in administrative officers. This will prove meaningful, but was not itself an action significant, for instance, of Convention's determination on a change of policy, or of Convention's determination on any policy, but an action which followed naturally in the filling of vacancies. The selections, to distinguish them from the elections, were significant, and Convention is sure of the adequacy of its officers, whether these were newly elected or re-elected men. There were the resolutions on disarmament. We were joining our voices to those of others. It seemed to us that the conscience as well as the pocket of the "larger man" had been touched, and that it was the moment to add whatever small influence we had in these large matters. There was the generally expected re-election of Mr. Gould as Editor of the *Messenger*. The nearest to positive, original measures by the Convention of anything was no measure at all, but the unheralded emergence of a number of women in posts to which women were never elected before. This reflected sentiment, and not agitation. The adoption by Convention, as work of its own, of the work of the New York Association's Committee on the Ministry was an important step, taken in view of strong recommendations by that Committee for the recruiting and maintenance of the ministry, recommendations which were reached on a basis of facts carefully canvassed. This work was necessarily done out of Convention, and will continue to be so done. Reports came to Convention of considerable moment to the Church, and efforts will date from it which will mean much; but the Convention of 1921 itself, in the course of its meetings, did not do much above routine work. Are the annual meetings becoming too completely or necessarily clearing-houses for action initiated or determined elsewhere?

The general topic of the meetings of Convention, "Christian Freedom," did not serve to imbue the Convention with a purpose, as with the intention to pursue any measures which would help attain that freedom any more largely in human life. The papers, addresses and sermons on the subject were

more numerous than those on any one topic have been at any other Convention probably. The sermons in all our pulpits in Boston and vicinity were by appointment on the subject, "Christ the Liberator." Was one of the purposes of this followed up at all, the lump advertisement of all these services and places of worship in every city where Convention Sunday morning services were going forward? The chief of these sermons, at Bowdoin St., proved concretely suggestive, and forward-looking. The speakers at the two noon-day conferences dealt the most strictly with the main topic of Convention. One of the guests said the most workable things, as a guest or two did last year. Mr. Post's brief "seconding speech" was piquant and meaty. Among helpful isolated sayings did any have a simpler lucidity about them than the Rev. John Goddard's saying that we had considered freedom in many aspects: "in the natural sense of do as you please; in the rational sense of do as you ought; and in the spiritual sense of do as the Lord desires"? There was no pronouncement on the subject by Convention, to point out any purpose in the matter.

Informed interest in the business of the Convention always seems to be confined to too few. Two vital activities of the Convention are its missions and its publishing interests. Both of these made studied efforts to engage attention and thought. The Missions Board had a varied exhibit in the Vestry of the Bowdoin St. Church. How many of the contributors, even, to that work studied this exhibit? Certainly the exhibit of the Publishing Houses, and as part of this the handsomely done work of the New-Church Press, were passed by. What can be done to extend informed interest in Convention's ordinary run of business? A small piece of assistance to delegates is suggested by the vote of the Convention on the Board of Managers of the Theological School. The outcome of that vote is not being criticized, except perhaps that it gave us not as many laymen as would be useful on the Board; but were the delegates put in position to vote with information? Among the nominees named were two laymen, one an educator, one a prominent New-Churchman on the Pacific Coast, a section of

the country which could well be represented on the Board always, but especially when a Convention-wide effort to strengthen the School is in prospect. Both these nominees, for lack of frequent attendance on Convention, are relatively unknown to Convention-goers. The educator was present; the layman from the Coast, counting on a Convention early in June, and having arranged business in the East for transaction then, and made his trip accordingly, could not wait over until Convention at the later date. When two ministers were nominated from the floor, who are familiar figures, they were the only men for whom the delegates could vote except in the dark. Would it be out of order for a Committee on Nominations to supply facts about nominees?

Few Conventions have attained to an ideal general meeting, which we can imagine well enough, in which the essential work of the Church gets initiated, re-directed, revised, the fruitless or misconceived pruned away. The report of the Committee on Publicity contained suggestions for such a meeting. The essence of publicity is in a conception of our work for the times, and in a true estimate of the world that lies around us. In much the same way the report of the Evidence Society indicated what significant conferences we might have on this the heart of all our work—its best conception, and the approach in it to others. Must there not be studied adjustment right along to what our work has come to be, and to the changing world in which it is to be done? Short of this highest success, the meetings of 1921 were very good. They were well attended, though not heavily, of course, from the middle or far West. Most sessions were interesting. Judge Barnard, Vice-President for twenty years, won new esteem for himself as a presiding officer. The memorial service for the late President of Convention was affecting and impressive, Mr. Roeder revealing in the list of Mr. Smyth's gifts and of his contributions to the Church, Mr. Sperry happy in his depiction of Mr. Smyth as "peculiarly at the heart of the Church." Hundreds found the deepest religious helpfulness and satisfaction in the Union Communion service of Sunday afternoon; preceding this service three men were ordained

into the ministry. The business sessions of Convention disclosed conditions which probably of themselves determine the course of immediate effort by us as a Church. Our resources seem not to be keeping up with our opportunities or even with our obligations. Such was the purport of the financial reports of the *New-Church Messenger,* of the Board of Missions, and of the Pension Fund. There follows naturally the new President's emphasis (in the closing service, and in a message in the *Messenger* of July 13) on strengthening our local units, which are our ultimate resources. The closing service was filled with an encouraging sense of the intimacy of co-workers in one great cause. Whether in this moment of parting with those present at Convention, or on his acceptance of the emphatic vote given him for President, the new President of the Convention appeared to excellent advantage, with evidence, for one thing, that in the simple strength of a desire to be useful to the full he brings a telling quality to the duties of his office. In Mr. E. H. Alden as Vice-President he was given a former co-worker, and a vigorous and incisive presiding officer for his executive associate.

Leading into the meetings of the Convention itself or attending on them there were all the meetings of auxiliary bodies into which a program of Convention has expanded in the course of the years. The meetings of the Council of Ministers in the Chapel of the Theological School were well attended and active. The closing exercises of the School were made a part of the Council's session, the Chairman of the Council also making the principal address. More decidedly an innovation was the Conference of Tuesday evening, when a minister, a layman and a laywoman discussed ways of giving greater popular appeal to our services. It was on a larger scale what a pastor's conference with the men and women of his parish would be. There were memorials to two conspicuous workers for long years in the Convention, the Rev. James Reed and the Rev. John S. Saul. The work of the Council's Committee on the Annotation of "Conjugial Love," it was reported, had issued in the offer of a set of Notes on that work to any publishers who may care to include them in an edition of the

book; they had been so offered to the Rotch Trustees in particular. The Convention later directed the Chairman of the Council to appoint a Committee to compile a book of extracts on marriage, from the Theological Works. The Alumni of the Theological School held a meeting in the home of the President of the School, at which they took steps to help with the campaign for the increase in the School's endowment. Mr. Hoeck, after nine years of fair and hearty service as Chairman of the Council, declined re-election, and was succeeded by the Rev. Paul Sperry. Similarly Mr. Gould stepped out of the Secretaryship, giving place to the Rev. F. Sidney Mayer. A marked ability at just and condensed report had characterized Mr. Gould's work as Secretary.

The Sunday School Association had accepted two sessions instead of three, an experiment which turned out poorly, for matters better discussed and settled in full meeting were referred for settlement to the Standing Committee. There was a determined feeling that the Schools should have a paper of their own, and it was voted that *Sunday Afternoons* be continued. The effort to secure some support for the paper from the Convention failed, but the obligation of the Church to give more than haphazard support to its Schools has only to be recognized and met now informally. Thursday evening's main paper presented with poetic power the value of bringing the realities for which the Church stands to the minds and senses of the children in the helpful and impressive surroundings of the Church itself, and not in such poor substitutes for these right surroundings as most Sunday-school rooms are. Gains were reported in Cradle Roll and Home Department. A layman in the Presidency of the Association would probably represent a healthier distribution of interest in the Sunday school. Workers in the national field seemed, in general, too few.

League and Women's Alliance met on Friday, simultaneously in the afternoon. The meetings of both bodies showed good activity during the year. The League had a wide reading of its *Journal* to report, a membership near the 1000 mark, the accession of three new leagues, growth of the Reading Circle,

steps toward the full formation of an International League, participation in the raising of a building fund for the Filipino work. The 33rd Conference nevertheless was small. The date of Convention was put late, we will recall, to let teachers and college men and women attend. Is there any evidence that they did? The devotional meeting was not so well attended as has been the case of recent years.

The Sunday evening meeting in the interest of missions was a successful step towards the information of Convention delegates in the work and results and opportunities of the Board. Our liveliest activity to-day is in mission fields. Opportunities offer right along for which there will be no provision unless financial support is kept up to the point to which it was brought the year before last. With money being raised in large sums for other projects, this will be a little hard to do, yet it must be done if we are not to lose plain opportunities. There was a time when we prayed for these opportunities!

The Forum, once the Round Table, which has steadily gained upon the attention of Convention-goers, despite the fact that it has held its meetings after Convention closed, will take steps to win a more favorable place hereafter on the program. The "Arcana Class" had its first meeting in connection with Convention. The Sex Education League, after some thought of disbanding, decided to continue.

The Convention of 1921 assembled expectant. We met, knowing that our leadership would be changed, and knowing pretty well into what hands it would come, always under higher leadership. We enter on a year of work in the interim of Conventions, expectant now of the touch of fresh conception and energy on our activities. There are important things to do toward which Convention turned us. We shall wish these well on the way to accomplishment or fully accomplished when we meet next as guests of the Ohio Association—at Urbana, the expectation is.

WILLIAM F. WUNSCH.

THE URBANA UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENT

The friends of Urbana University and of New Church Higher Education generally were rejoiced to hear the Announcement to the recent Convention and to the Church at large that an Endowment of something over $300,000.00 had been raised, thereby increasing the productive funds of the Institution to about $450,000.00.

The significance of this achievement is far greater than the mere fact of raising the money. In the first place, there were personal agents of immediate importance and of enduring human interest which have impressed us deeply and inspiringly as providential co-workers. As foremost among these, we all spontaneously think of Mr. Smyth and his daughter Mrs. Charles S. Buell. This Endowment was in a special and most real sense a monument to Mr. Smyth's zeal, energy, and leadership, in devoting himself with sublime faith and loyalty to the cause of his *Alma Mater,* to the sure and ennobling future of Urbana University — a monument raised by his daughter with the extraordinarily enthusiastic and confident support of the Church people throughout our Broad Land and Canada. The story of this devotion and achievement throbs with exalted and tender human interest, and is worthy of the poet's finest effort. We cannot forego on this occasion a rapid and faint sketch.

Julian Kennedy Smyth, son of Joseph Kennedy Smyth and Julia Ogden, entered Urbana University in the year 1871 at the age of 15. He came from a gifted race, and from a cultivated home of social position and influence. It is recorded that his mother's wish was that one of her sons might be a New-Church minister. However this may be, his parents, recently domiciled in a home of elegance on the famous banks of the Hudson, sent him to Urbana University, the small far off New-Church School in central Ohio, then presided over by the young Rev. Frank Sewall. The atmosphere and the personal contacts of the School proved congenial and inspiring. Mr. Sewall became at once and for the rest of his life a guiding spirit and a constant friend. It was in large measure Mr.

Sewall's poetic charm, his unflagging zeal and energy, his lofty ideals of New-Church education and New-Church life, that inspired the boy with unfailing loyalty and with ever growing appreciation of the School both as it was in its actual working and as the possibility of immense and indispensable service to the Church and to the whole community. Its history and its possibilities appealed to him as a romantic and high adventure which aroused sentiments of knight errantry and of heroic devotion. He looked back upon the bright figures of its history as heroic pioneers who ventured all their gifts for its cause. To him it was a manly and ennobling achievement to devote one's powers and possessions to a small and struggling institution with its high aims and use.

A generation before he entered the School, a few sturdy and prophetic spirits, foremost among whom were John Hough James and James Park Stuart, with penetrating foresight and large comprehension, laid the foundations of the Institution of learning

to be known as the Urbana University, designed to encourage and promote the diffusion of knowledge, in the branches of academic, scientific, and exegetic instruction, and to combine therewith instruction in the productive arts and the practice of rural economy: which shall be under the management and direction of persons known and recognized as belonging to the New Church, or attached to the Principles thereof.

The Board of Trustees shall appoint a President of said University, ... ;they may establish such professorships, schools and faculties, as the means and wants of the institution will justify and require, ... ; they may also grant and confer all the usual and honorary degrees, which are granted by colleges and universities. . . . They may also acquire all such estates, real, personal, and mixed, as may be needful and convenient for the uses of said university and the departments thereof, or for the endowment and support of any particular college, school, professorship or scholarship therein; and all such estates and funds shall be strictly applied to the uses and trusts specified by the donor.

This language, taken from the charter, shows the broad intentions and the high aims of the founders. The charter provides an educational institution of the most varied and extensive character, whose development is limited only by the means in hand and the ideas in control.

Beginning on this broad foundation and with advanced ideas of a liberal education, the school at once encountered the inevitable practical difficulties. It opened its doors to students of both sexes September, 1850; and two years later, on the first land donated to the University, the donation of Col. John H. James, the first college building, "Bailey Hall," was completed. Mr. Milo G. Williams as head and a small faculty of five carried on all the instruction; the learned J. F. Leonhard Tafel, Ph. D., had the Department of Language, and the Rev. James P. Stuart, A. M., that of Philosophy. The curriculum covered both preparatory and college classes. The encouraging attendance from far and near showed a real demand for the type of education offered; in the session of 1855-6 it had grown to 128. But the small overburdened faculty was unequal to its ambitious task; aside from other difficulties, it was impossible for such a faculty to meet the demands of the comparatively large and greatly varied body of students. When these conditions became pronounced, the dissatisfaction showed itself by the dropping off of the attendance until 1860; and the disturbed state of mind throughout the country occasioned by the imminence of civil war brought the School to a virtual close. In 1870, Mr. Sewall became President, and imparted unbounded zeal and high courage at the same time that he created a scholarly atmosphere and a well ordered curriculum. Early in his administration, two boys, to become imperishable figures in its annals, entered the School as upper and lower classmates, Julian Kennedy Smyth September, 1871 and Thomas Coleman du Pont September, 1876; one, at this latter date, a graduate student in the Theological Department, the other a beginner in the Fourth Form. It was the communion of spirit developed in the religious and academic atmosphere of Urbana University that brought these two men together in later life and bound them to the common task of lifting their *Alma Mater* to a higher level of prosperity and usefulness.

For more than a half a century, Urbana University had been struggling nobly under manifold disadvantages to do its appointed task, at first with no endowment but the character of the men who composed the faculty, the beautiful ten acre

lot of land, and the simple yet dignified "Bailey Hall. As time passed, gifts of land and money came, an additional academic building, Barclay Hall, was put up, and two Dormitories added. Through the untiring exertions, the high courage, and the indomitable will of Mr. Sewall, the first considerable endowment of $50,000.00 was raised. Later, donations from the daughters of Wm. A. Ropes amounted to $61,631, of which $52,000 was given to endow the Department of Modern Languages. At the beginning of the session 1920-21, the estimated total endowment was $154,072.

In the meantime, the cost of labor and materials had increased to such an extent that in order to keep up the standard of instruction and meet the educational demands, strenuous and constant efforts had to be made to supplement the regular income by personal solicitation for subscriptions to the sustaining fund. It was at this critical juncture that three timely benefactors came forward, Mr. Smyth, Mr. du Pont, and Mr. James G. Wentz (another classmate); and as the result of their interest and co-operation the level of the School was maintained. Throughout this emergency, Mr. Smyth was more and more depended upon to meet the occasion, and his attention and efforts were more and more concentrated upon the task of substantial and permanent improvement. Then as difficulties seemed to culminate he made the joyous announcement to the Board of Trustees that his fellow *Alumnus,* General T. Coleman du Pont, had offered to give Urbana University $100,000.00, on the condition that the friends of the School would raise an equal amount. This offer lifted the whole situation to a higher plane; and gave the friends of the School new vision and new courage. The Board immediately at its June meeting, 1920, appointed one of its most active members, Mr. E. A. Munger of Chicago, to head the committee named to raise the money. Mr. Munger made a careful survey of the personnel of the Church for the one to act as Field Agent and immediate Director of the canvass. The choice fell happily, indeed we must say Providentially, upon Mr. Smyth's daughter, Mrs. Buell, who proved in the eyes of all to have extraordinary gifts for the work in hand. She had her Father's tact, his

grace of speech; but above all the mantle of her Father's zeal and loyalty for the cause she was to represent and promote fell upon her; and she at once devoted all the energy and intelligence of her highly endowed nature to the great undertaking. Her success was truly immediate and electric; the whole body of the Church became inspired with her energy and by her gracious appeal. Every one recognized that she was holding aloft her Father's banner, the symbol of his high devotion to his Church and his *Alma Mater*. The pathos and heroism of his latter days were personified and glorified in the spirit of the daughter and by the flame that burned with radiant light in her soul. It is literally true that Mr. Smyth, during the last few years of his life dedicated and consecrated his gifted nature to the accomplishment of his consuming purpose to set the School of his youth and the higher education of his little flock upon a hill, whence its light would shine for all who looked to it. Even at the very last, just before the end, he wrote to a friend and companion in his labor of love for the advancement of the School a long letter full of suggestions and plans for making Urbana University the fulfilment of his heart's desire, a university in fact as well as in name.

It is no small thing that Urbana University has had for its Presidents some of the foremost leaders of the Church, Chauncey Giles, Frank Sewall, Lewis Pyle Mercer, and Julian Kennedy Smyth: we cannot forget that although Mr. Smyth did not actually serve as President, nevertheless he was after Mr. Sewall's death, Chairman and the recognized leader of the Board of Trustees, and thus had a commanding position in shaping and directing the policies of the School, and that finally the Executive Committee of the Board with historic and official, though as the event proved pathetic, appropriateness elected him President too late for him to accept. These four men impressed upon the School their characters, their ideals, and the wealth of their experience, and helped to make it what it is in spirit, in purpose, and within its means in effort. But it was Mr. Smyth whose spirit presided over every movement of the Endowment campaign to whom we must look as the real author of its vitalizing success. It was his

spirit that moved the workers and givers alike. His known devotion to the cause, his active leadership, and his personal influence as originator, gave the movement its popular appeal. Mrs. Buell personified all these traits and motives; and she threw herself with commanding genius into the work of organizing and operating every department of her field. She faced unaccustomed and unforeseen difficulties and triumphantly mastered them. Her friends and co-workers felt from the start and predicted that her success was sure and that it would be speedy. Accordingly, after the few spring months of intense and concentrated effort on the part of the many workers, the indefatigable Treasurer of Urbana University, Mr. Fenton Lawson, was able to announce that the needed $100,000.00 had been raised. At this stage, the canvass was being pressed with almost feverish energy to push the amount raised to the greatest extent possible. Then the friends and workers were cheered and immensely stimulated by the good news that General du Pont had removed the limitation and would match a larger amount. Among those who responded to this enlarged opportunity, Mrs. Charles Vinal came forward with the offer to give $25,000.00 if a like amount were raised to match it. This put still greater energy and enthusiasm into the canvass, and by Convention time the amount was raised, and the endowment of Urbana University was increased to the encouraging sum of about $450,000.00.

But it is not so much the importance of this sum, nor the inestimable heritage of the names connected with it, that must claim our attention and appreciation. The fact that 1500 persons in sums varying from one dollar to $150,000.00 were contributors is the solid basis of our hope and reliance for the future. This number of people from all quarters of the country and throughout the membership of the Convention have expressed in this material form their interest in the welfare of the School and in New Church higher education. In awakening this interest and giving it this concrete basis, the canvass has been an incalculable educational achievement. It has concentrated the educational interest of the entire membership of Convention upon the work the School may do for the young

people of the Church. Upon this living foundation, the School may now go forward. We may expect in the near future more numerous and even more generous contributions, until we have the land and the buildings which would be an adequate equipment for the Urbana University of our posterity.

But the privilege of this enlarged patronage and support imposes a corresponding duty upon the School. The first and most obvious duty is to preserve intact and make the most of the funds now in hand. This means in the truest and most important sense that the income from this endowment shall be used for the maintainance of the best faculty obtainable. There are many more or less indispensable features of the complete equipment of a school of higher education — lands, buildings, laboratories, library, gymnasium, dormitories, and other less imperative features — but the real existence of a school is the faculty which gives the instruction; and the level of the school, the character of higher education, depends primarily on the quality of the teachers rather than on their number. William and Mary College did the work of higher education for Thomas Jefferson, the Randolphs, and other Revolutionary leaders, with a small faculty of not more than six members, but they were men of large personalities and of educated scholarly abilities. The University of Virginia started with a faculty of seven selected by Mr. Jefferson from the best scholars obtainable in this country and Europe, and at once took high rank among the universities of the world. A later instance was Johns Hopkins University with its faculty of six headed by Basil L. Gildersleeve, which took at the start the front rank of universities doing graduate work. These three institutions illustrate most impressively the fact that it is the character of the men who compose the faculty that gives to a school the level of its education.

It is true that Urbana University is limited in the choice of teachers not only by its means but also by the small body of teachers from which to select. In the cases cited, the faculties were rare combinations of men of the highest abilities; Urbana University may not expect for years to come to have a faculty of this exceptionally high character, but even now there are

educated New Churchmen from whom the selection might be made. If such men were willing to give up their present positions for the opportunity to devote their lives to New Church higher education, and accept the modest salaries which at present Urbana University can offer, the School would at once be in a position to command the patronage of the most gifted sons and daughters of the Church; it would also inspire public confidence and claim the support of all New Churchmen both of large and small means. It may be that men of such high position and advanced scholarship would not respond to the call, and would prefer to pursue their accustomed careers; in that case, the alternative would be to select among the younger men of the Church the most gifted and the most highly educated, men of marked promise and tried abilities. There is no doubt that a small faculty of such men could be obtained, if they were offered the conditions of a worthy and permanent career. The difficulty, therefore, of securing a competent New Church Faculty is not serious, certainly not insuperable. What is imperatively and instantly needed is a systematic canvass of the Church for a complete list of the highly educated young people as a basis for the selection of the teachers desired. At present, there is no such list, and consequently we are in the dark as to the available material even for extending our present faculty.

If this is a fair statement of the case, and if there is reasonable assurance that men of the desired qualifications are to be found, important and insistent questions remain. To put the questions very briefly: What sized faculty should the School seek to obtain and at what salaries? What would be a suitable curriculum; what departments, schools, or courses should be instituted? These, of course, are questions for the School authorities and experts to answer: no one can assume to speak for them. Nevertheless all New Churchmen, and especially the 1500 contributors to the new endowment may have ideas and opinions based upon the present estimated income. It is reasonable, for example, to assume that the income presently available will be approximately $25,000.00. At an average salary of $2000.00 the income would support a faculty of *ten*

well qualified men. Bearing in mind that the whole of this income is not immediately available and that there will be more or less delay in getting together such a faculty, it is evident that some time must elapse before this program could be put in full operation. It is clear, however, that we have the *basic facts* for anticipating this improved status of the School.

Next to the faculty, the curriculum is the most vital feature of an educational institution. The subjects to be taught, the kind and extent of the instruction, the co-ordination of the subjects in the curriculum are considerations which bring us to the heart of the educational controversies of the day. From the point of view of a liberal education and from the point of view of the student body, and more particularly, from the point of view of New-Church educational ideals, it is safe to say that the faculty of ten should be assigned to the following great divisions of academic instruction: 1. English, 2. History, 3. The Classics, 4. Modern Languages, 5. Mathematics, 6. Physics and Chemistry, 7. Biology, 8. Psychology, 9. Philosophy, 10. Religious Instruction. This curriculum is simple, fundamental and comprehensive; it is adapted to the needs and demands of the general student body and fulfils the requirements of advanced liberal education. The religious instruction, like that in the other departments, would naturally and inevitably expand to meet the requirements of the students as well as the requirements of the educational standard. With the growth of the endowment and the attendance the faculty would be correspondingly enlarged, and this would go on to the stage of complete equipment for well rounded and advanced academic education. In the meantime, as the Charter provides, departments and courses in the Arts, the Productive Arts, as well as the Fine Arts, would be added as the occasion and the general educational scheme and ideal demanded. In fact, the departments of Domestic Science and Mechanics Arts are now in operation.

The 1500 contributors who have added this epoch making endowment to the resources of the School are directly interested to see some such program of New Church higher education put in operation with the least possible delay. These

contributors and the membership of the Convention generally share with the Board of Trustees and the Faculty of Urbana University the responsibility of putting and keeping the School in the position to educate our young people in accordance with our highest ideals. The forces and motives, the personalities and the ideals which brought the endowment campaign to a successful issue may be depended on to operate for still greater results.

LEWIS F. HITE.

REVUE DE L'ERE NOUVELLE

We welcome this new venture into the field of New-Church journalism. The *Revue de L'Ere Nouvelle* is a quarterly published by the Federation of New-Church Societies of French-speaking people. It is attractive in appearance, and the table of contents shows articles on subjects of perennial interest. It is on sale at 1 Bloomsbury Street, London, England, and 108 Clark Street, Brooklyn, N. Y. This French *Review* is an appeal not only to all French-speaking people, but to all friends of this promising New-Church movement in France, under the able leadership of the Rev. Gustave E. Regamey, with headquarters at Lausanne. We extend to the editor, M. H. G. Germuller, our hearty congratulations, and bespeak for him generous support in the form of subscriptions and contributions.

THE EDITORS.

BIBLICAL AND DOCTRINAL STUDIES

THE OUTCOME OF THE GLORIFICATION OF THE LORD.

What the glorification of the Lord effected for God and for man is a difficult question. Although we can say much respecting that great process and its outcome we cannot keep from feeling that there is infinitely more in His life and mission than is contained in any human description or explanation. We should not wonder if the angels of heaven find Christ's Person glorified for ever veiled to finite gaze by the mystery of Divinity. In attempting, then, to describe something of the result of the Lord's glorification, a consciousness that the subject is no less sacred than profound should hold us in awe of the fact of His Divinity.

The gospels teach plainly that the Lord underwent a glorification. For in them such a process is spoken of as, "Now is the Son of Man glorified," and "O, Father, glorify thou me with thine own self." This glorification of the Lord, by which the redemption of man was accomplished, was the object and result of the incarnation. It is the union of Father and Son. Christ seemed to have been conscious of growing into this at-one-ment. "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?" Glimpses, indeed, of the glorious outcome did He experience when His consciousness, lifted to God through the higher reaches of His Person, enabled Him to say, "I and the Father are one," or "if ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also," In keeping with this Scripture, we find the statements in Swedenborg: "The Lord came into the world to make Divine the whole Human in Himself" (Arcana Coelestia, n. 3737)

and "The Lord's life was a continual progression of the Human to the Divine, even to absolute union" (ibid., n. 2523).

The result was the perfect Son of God. And this is marvelous, if we follow the thought of Swedenborg. For the boy Jesus did not at first know who He was. He "was not wholly Divine from birth;" He had only the capacity of becoming Divine. He was liable to defeat in His mission like any man. He was like any other in that He had to learn and live. I can imagine, from reading the "Arcana," the boy Jesus at the age of twelve, or perhaps shortly before, getting the tremendous conviction that Jehovah of the Old Testament, the God of His people, was His Father in a peculiar way. Then, with a sweep of vision back through the heavens He perceived that He must be about His Father's business; and then the struggle as light broke upon Him that, if He lived the law of God and the perceptions from Divine Love within Him, He could become one with the Father and save men. The tremendousness of it! After such insights into the very love and plan of God, no wonder such states of humiliation followed. At first He thought He could save men by a command of the weapons of truth that would convince intellects and persuade hearts. But no; after discussing with the doctors He must go back to Nazareth and, in those years of silence, labor to bring Divine Love into every thought, word and deed. With a retrospective glance at His life foretold in the Old Testament He saw that Isaac must be called to sacrifice: that the gathering of the precious realities of Divine Truth meant more than the acquisition of an intellectual armory, but rather, more and more unselfish living. That was the struggle back to the bosom of the Father whereby human functions and capacities were made perfect in Divine Manhood and men once more given access to life.

How did this human and Divine experience affect the Divine? Can we say that there was a change in God? Our minds immediately struggle to hold as true the idea that God is eternally changeless, and we think it is true. Yet, was there not something realized in God? There was a potential degree in God to be made actual (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 233).

This thought may be a way of approach to an understanding of the fulness of the Divine in Christ. We are trying to speak in terms of God's purposes in self-realization, not of time and space. He had been from eternity the Infinite God; and had been, therefore, the life of angels, the immanent Manhood eternal in the heavens, the Giver of humanity. By the glorification of the assumed human His potential natural was made actual. This means for God a great step actually into the life of the world: the realization of a base in the world from which He could send out His Divine influences through the vital force of every atom and immediately through the inmosts of all the residents of the earth; the implanting in the highest consciousness of every man a spirit which should persistently lead him into truth and life.

God through the glorification of His Human realized a consciousness in the realm of man's life which had been potential in His nature. We, to follow Swedenborg, must take the Human of our Lord in earnest; He was fully and truly human; yet, more, He had the capacity of becoming Divine. No finite fatherhood intervened between His human consciousness and that of His inmost life which was Jehovah (Arcana Coelestia, n. 4963). No limits confined that human consciousness to the measures of the human: a sort of Jacob's ladder, by virtue of God's indivisibility, allowed that consciousness to travel back (when not fighting evil) through the Human realized in angelic life, through His inmost to the bosom of the Father. Yet all the Divine that came into actuality through Him passed through the restricting and faulty human consciousness. He was liable to sin and was tempted. But He made His human consciousness Divine: it has become the servant of God's mercy and Love and announces to Him man's needs and struggles. Knowing what it is to feel and think as men feel and think, and aware of every spiritual and physical condition as well as the precise touch of the Divine hand needed, He provides to eternity a full operation of Divine Love and Wisdom in human and all life. He can "keep all things in order to eternity" (Arcana Coelestia, n. 10659[3]).

I think we make no mistake in placing emphasis on the

Humanity of our Lord, nor, at the same time, on the Divineness of His works. If, like Swedenborg, we think of Him during glorification as other men, that is, subject to growth and temptation we are not conceiving Him as a Person frequently denied all Divine attributes but as a Person in whom Divine attributes are really operating in the process of a fuller Divine realization. He came among men in a Humanity whose Divinity was veiled to those whose heart-sight was no deeper than eye-sight. Yet the Divine was there deep within Him, and His whole Person became gradually a full expression of it. He made Himself "Divine from Himself."

The fact of a real human consciousness in Christ in no way argues a divisibility of the Divine for that consciousness was only capable of becoming Divine, nor then does it mean a surrendering of Divine consciousness whereby the Divine Being would be mutilated.

In regard to the resurrection of our Lord, Swedenborg states that the "Lord rose from the sepulchre with His whole body which he had in the world" (True Christian Religion, n. 109). Again, "since the Human of the Lord was glorified, that is, was made Divine, therefore He arose after death on the third day with His whole body; which never happens to any man, for he only rises as to his spirit and not as to his body." We have come here to a difficult problem. Swedenborg seems to say that the Lord rose with the actual physical body which He had in the world. However, he warns us to think spiritually of this, which does not mean necessarily that we should restrict the process of glorification to things of the spirit. Perhaps a scheme of the structure of our Lord's Person would help here. Above the this-world consciousness of the Lord were the Inmost, the Divine Human attained in the heavens and the mind immediately alive to heaven. Below were the rational faculty, the mind alive to this world including the senses, and the body. We are concerned now with the latter part of this scheme and what it signifies in the experience of Christ. "Not only the rational, but also the sensual, thus the whole body, was also made Divine and Jehovah" (Arcana Coelestia, n. 2083). Are we to believe from this statement that the "sensual" was the

ultimate of the Body which was made Divine? Some choose to think so in order to avoid the apparent contradiction of "infinite and Divine matter."

On the other hand, "The natural of our Lord's infancy, even, was Divine from the Father but human from the mother" (Arcana Coelestia, n. 3599[2]). This and other passages lead us to the conclusion that throughout the lower structure of Christ's Person, spoken of above, ran an "infirm human" from the mother and a Divine Human capacity from the Father. If this is true we may conceive that the physical body as well as the "sensual" was glorified. In the Theological Works we come to declarations that He glorified His Human down to the corporeal, and this word is used in at least two ways: "The corporeal of man is that which sees . . . hears . . . tastes . . . It is properly called flesh" (Spiritual Diary, n. 4627). The "corporeal" is comprehensive of the sensuous and the flesh. We are convinced that the Writings teach that the physical body was glorified. This was made possible by virtue of the Divine Human capacity in the body. How are we to understand this? We are familiar with passages stating that in the sepulchre that which was material from the mother was put off, and that He rose with the identical body which He had in the world. In other words the "infirm human" by conscious determination was gradually outgrown, and the Divine Human capacity awakened and developed. The body then was both dissipated and glorified. The dissipation was a process concurrent with the union with the Father. They were of a common purpose. The Son of Mary had been daily dying, and the Son of God day by day realized on earth.

This whole process was under Providence. He rose, indeed, from the sepulchre with the Body He had in the world but so much of the human from Mary had been outgrown and discarded that His mother did not recognize Him. He Himself, becoming one with the Father, regulated the gradual dissipation of the human till, at last, when fully glorified the Disciples saw Him no more, and the record comes to us that He ascended into heaven. The result is that God has hands, feet and eyes, or rather the corresponding functions, by which He operates

in human life. He has "feet—, as if glowing in a furnace;" and because of them men are sternly led into the struggle of purifying themselves and society. "His eyes as a flame of fire" penetrate to the heart of all right and wrong and minister with love. Omnipotent, Lord of the universe and operative in all impulse, thought, sensation and action, all assimilation of food or building up of the body's tissues in rest, He holds "in His right hand seven stars." "The Lord's Body itself, when glorified is nothing but Divine love" (Arcana Coelestia, n. 6135[3]).

What did the glorification of the Lord involve for man? We have this statement to begin with, "Jehovah God descended and assumed a Human that He might redeem men and save them." Man was redeemed to the possibility of reclaiming spiritual life. This included the two worlds of human life: angels and men were sharers in the reestablishment of freedom. Christ must have been in close relation to the heavens to accomplish this work. He was indeed, consciously engaged in fighting sin and limitation on the heavenly plane of life as on this. He was born a "spiritual celestial man," we find stated in the Writings. That, I gather, means that there was a tract in the Person of Christ which was the "Divine Human" embodied in the life of angels. Through this part of His Person ran the "infirm human." The heavens were disturbed by infernal tendencies to drop from a life of love and duty. In glorification the Lord overcame the "infirm human" and thereby emancipated angels from tendencies to sin and set on foot great movements into a higher and more serviceable life. The celestial heavens were recipients of this Divine work. They were gathered into one glorious body and allowed to seek life by ways truest to their natures. Clothed upon with a clearer consciousness of the Divine they felt a stronger will toward becoming His image and likeness (Arcana Coelestia, n. 3881). A greater work was done for the spiritual heavens. "The cause of the Lord's coming into the world was that the spiritual might be saved" (Arcana Coelestia, n. 2716). Those of spiritual type were established and ordered by glorification of the Lord's Human. They were given a separate spiritual

organization by which they might seek the Lord through the path of truth and neighborly service. A work was done among men, a purely Divine work, and a great example was given them. It was a dark world into which Christ came; a time replete with accumulated falsity, deluded religiosity and "systematic ignorance and sleep of the soul," — a time of idolizing lifeless things, of worshipping magic and superstition (True Christian Religion, n. 121). Christ judged this age, conquered its falsity and reinterpreted its ancient religion. Through His own power, with His inherited infirm humanity allowing the forces of evil and of delusion to rush upon Him, He taught and showed men the truth and the life.

"Before the assumption of the Human the Divine influx into the natural degree was mediate through angelic heavens, but after the assumption of the Human was immediate from Himself" (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 233). The Lord became a great power for good among men. They felt Him speaking through their inmost consciences, pressing upon their wills and leading them in a vast movement into spiritual life. This movement found expression in Christianity, the Lord's Church of love and service, titanic in potentiality from its birth, for the heavens were back of it and the Divine Humanity its heart and Master.

Finally, the Theological Works repeatedly speak of the Divine Human as the Savior for all time. The Lord took on the whole body of our life and purifying it became Perfect Manhood into whose image and likeness mankind will ever press and grow. He stepped into our body of life and found there things perverted, — poor assimilation of food, for instance, and obsession, crooked reasoning, delusion, hatred for men and duty, trust in the findings of the senses and sight limited to the vanities of this world. He gradually saw how all this perversion acted against Divine Order and purpose, and through His own power corrected these evil and false tendencies. Now He is able to anticipate men's needs and trouble, to prevent conditions that would overpower the spirit and to lead into life.

For men and angels, then, He is the blazing of the way.

His life and words show what human life and intercourse ought to be. His eternal presence in men's goodwill and service is "enlightening, teaching and inspiring." The Holy Spirit of truth present with man mediately through angels (Doctrine of the Lord, n. 46) and immediately through the Lord's Glorified Humanity (True Christian Religion, n. 139) is active in the struggles and peace of men, — great forces of God's justice, love and care beyond which no palm lifts its distant leaf nor man can drift.

HENRY F. REYNOLDS.

THE APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION AND THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE.

THE Lambeth Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion was held at Lambeth Palace, July 5 to August 7, 1920. A strong appeal was made to all Christian people for the reunion of all Christian Churches. To effect this union, the following principles were presented as the basis on which it should be established. The report reads:

VI. We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of:—

The Holy Scriptures, as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; and the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostle's Creed as the Baptismal confession of belief.

The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ.

A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body.

VII. May we not reasonably claim that the Episcopate is the one means of providing such ministry? . . .

VIII. . . . Bishops and clergy of our [Anglical] Communion would willingly accept . . . [from other Communions] a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations. . . .

It is our hope that the same motive would lead ministers who have not received it to accept a commission through episcopal ordination as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship. (Pp. 134-5.)

The whole report makes clear that the Lambeth Conference regarded as essential to unity the ordination of ministers by bishops, who themselves had been ordained through an unbroken succession of ordinations from the apostles. This Apostolic Succession it concedes to the Church of Rome, the Orthodox Eastern Church, the Separated Churches of the East, the Church of Sweden, and the Old Catholics; doubt is expressed in regard to the validity of the claims for the Episcopate of Moravians and the Reformed Episcopal Church. (Pp. 156-161.) The Anglican Communion itself has been for years seeking recognition from the Pope of Rome of its ministry as having the true Apostolic Succession; but the Pope will not acknowledge it.

At a meeting of the clergy of Greater Boston held in the Boston Church of the New Jerusalem in the latter part of 1920, called to hear a report from Bishop Lawrence on the Lambeth Conference, at which Bishop Hughes of the Methodist Church presided, Bishop Lawrence presented this idea of having all ministers receive ordination through Apostolic Succession. At the close of Bishop Lawrence's address, Bishop Hughes declared that he would not submit to such ordination.

Church unity has received and is receiving great attention from the Churches. The proposition of the Bishops of the Anglican Church manifests their conception of the fundamental principle on which church unity must be based. Is that principle valid? Can a ministry be a genuine and full Christian ministry which has cut loose from the Apostolic Succession? Many Protestant Churches do not have the Apostolic Succession in their ministry. According to the Lambeth Conference there is in them something lacking which Episcopal ordination alone can give.

In the establishment of the New Church in England and America the idea of deriving any authorization for its ministry from the Old Church, whether Episcopal or non-Episcopal,

was totally rejected. The principle affirmed was that the New Church was totally separate from any branch of the Old: its doctrine was new, its worship was directed to our Lord God the Savior Jesus Christ alone, and it must begin *de novo* in all things, especially in its ministry. The pioneers of the New Church would not adopt the idea of the Apostolic Succession through the clergy of the Old. They made very clear their total severance from the Old as a matter of principle. Even if they had desired a ministry having the Apostolic Succession, it would have been impossible to obtain it; for no bishop of the Old would have ordained any New-Churchman into the ministry. Should we now repudiate their position?

In the "Apocalypse Revealed" (n. 802) Swedenborg says:

> From the religious persuasion meant by "Babylon," is the adulteration and profanation of every truth of the Word and thence of every holy thing of the Church. . . . God alone is to be worshipped and adored; . . . thus the vicarship is an invention and a fiction, which is to be rejected. . . . A man cannot ascribe to himself anything Divine without profanation; [and] . . . Peter did not ascribe it to himself, and therefore did not exercise any such authority; moreover the succession is a thing invented by that love [of dominion from the love of self]; as also the transferring of the Holy Spirit from man to man.

In the idea that the Lord gave the power of opening and shutting heaven, and that this power was transferred successively by Peter to others, to the Bishop or Pope of Rome, or from any of the apostles to their successors, is a pure invention, which was used to gain supreme power in the Church, first for the Pope of Rome; and from him was derived the power of the clergy over the people. The Pope of Rome claims that our Lord conferred this power and authority in saying to Peter,

> Blessed art thou Simon son of Jonah—I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven (Matt. xvi. 17-20.)

This saying of our Lord was called forth by Peter's confes-

sion, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God"; but in the same chapter, when our Lord foretold His crucifixion,

> Peter took Him, and began to rebuke Him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee. But He turned, and said unto Peter, Get thee behind Me, Satan; thou art an offense unto Me; for thou savorest not [R. V., mindest not] the things that be of God, but those that be of men.

If Papal authority rests on the Lord's saying, "On this rock I will build My Church," etc., then in like manner it must be admitted that Peter and his successors are liable to fall into error and become "Satan." Then in their errors what becomes of their claim to authority, Divine authority, of the priestly function as derived from a continuous succession from Peter? Anyone may see that in these two places Peter represents the faith of the Church. When he said "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," he spoke that truth which forms the foundation of the faith of the Church, which our Lord endorsed and commended as opening heaven to man. But when Peter uttered sentiments in opposition to the Lord, he was called "Satan." He then represents a false faith which is "an offense" ("a stumbling block" R. V.), that is, an hindrance to entrance into heaven.

It is recognized everywhere that the priesthood has in its historic development fallen into most grievous falsities and evils, both personal and official. When that has been the case, reform has generally come from without not from within. The revolt against these perversions has produced Protestantism. In the development of Protestantism the doctrine of the Apostolic Sucession at times was necessarily repudiated. Was this a sin and an error? If so, repentance is necessary and return to the succession is essential to a truly constituted ministry. If so, the proposition of the Anglican Bishops should be accepted, or preferably reunion with the Roman Catholic Church. Before accepting such a conclusion, we should consider the opposite position, that the doctrine of succession itself is an error. Is it not possible for the Holy Spirit to flow into the hearts and minds of men directly, to reveal Himself anew and to establish and found a true Christian Church inde-

pendent of any laying on of hands successively from the Apostles down to the present day?

There is no doubt concerning the fact that *the laying on of hands* was customary in inauguration into the Christian ministry. Yet it does not appear that the Apostles themselves were inaugurated by the laying on of hands, when the Lord appeared to them and commissioned them to go into all the world and preach the Gospel. He lifted up His hands and blessed them. Moreover when the eleven met together to select one to take the place of Judas, they put forward two, and Matthias was selected by lot, and "he was numbered with the eleven Apostles." It does not appear that in conferring the apostleship upon him there was inauguration by the laying on of hands. In the case of Paul there were two occasions in which hands were laid on him: first, when his blindness was cured, and it is said he then received the Holy Spirit and began to preach; second, when he and Barnabas were separated and sent out—"When they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away." In the first case it was by command of the Lord, in the second by command of the Holy Spirit; but in neither case does it appear that the act was peformed by a "bishop."

In this earliest period of the Church, *the Lord* commissioned the eleven and sent them out without the laying on of hands. He also appointed Matthias by lot without the laying on of hands. This proves that the Lord gave the Holy Spirit without the formal laying on of hands. The case of Paul shows that he was authorized and sent out through the action of those who were not "bishops."

In the beginning of most of the great reform movements in the Church, the initiators of the movements were compelled by conditions to act independently and inaugurate a new ministry. Unless they had done this there would not have been any reform. Did not the Holy Spirit inspire and initiate all these movements, through which immense good has been accomplished in the world? How could the successors of these men repudiate their action by going back to secure an apostolic succession for their ministry?

One great fallacy lies in misunderstanding the significance of laying on the hands in inauguration into the ministry. It is not the "bishop" but the Lord Himself who gives His Spirit. It is not the gift of the officiating "bishop" but of the Lord. The Spirit does not flow through the "bishop" into the candidate but from the Lord into him. The laying on of hands is only a representation of its transmission from the Lord. This representation is useful; but its significance should be truly understood. The Lord is as truly present now to inaugurate candidates into the ministry of His Church as He was in the days of the Apostles. It is not necessary for a valid ministry that there be an unbroken chain of ordinations from the Apostles. The real essential is that the Divine Message, the Gospel, be given and received. Whenever that Gospel is perverted and the opposite is preached, the real internal connection with the Lord is broken, and the Divine authorization is withdrawn, howsoever perfect may be the external chain of succession of ordinations from the Apostles. In seeking Church Union we would suggest that the real essentials of the Church be sought, and that formalities be made secondary. We would suggest the following in place of the three propositions of the Lambeth Conference:

I. The Holy Scriptures as God's Divine Revelation to man.
II. Our Lord Jesus Christ as God manifest to men—The Word made flesh.
III. The sacrament of Baptism as the gate of introduction into the Church, and the sacrament of the Holy Supper as the symbol of conjunction with the Lord and of spiritual consociation with each other.
IV. A ministry for preaching and teaching from the Lord the Gospel to all the world.

JOHN WHITEHEAD.

CURRENT LITERATURE

"THE APOCALYPSE REVEALED," POPULARIZED IN FRENCH.*

By the recent book on the Apocalypse by the Rev. Charles Byse the French-speaking New Church is uniquely provided with literature on that book of the Bible from which the fact of a New Church is most directly and fully to be made out. Years ago Monsieur Le Buoys des Guays combined in a volume of 382 pages the interpretations of "The Apocalypse Revealed" and "The Apocalypse Explained." This gave the French New Church an excellent mechanical aid in the study of the Book of Revelation. Had references been included in it to "The Apocalypse Revealed" and "The Apocalypse Explained" to indicate what was taken from those works respectively, it would be a still more useful book; but as it is, it is a full and yet concise summary of the essential contents of those two works, and a valuable reference book. Now Mr. Byse contributes a fairly popular reproduction of the interpretation of "The Apocalypse Revealed," in less than half the compass of the work by Le Buoys des Guays—210 smaller pages—and yet does the interpretation in equal detail with the great original of Swedenborg. The French-speaking New Church therefore now has in its literature on the Book of Revelation a good mechanical aid for the student's reference library, and a popularization of "The Apocalypse Revealed" for general reading and missionary use.

The path to Mr. Byse's book was largely elimination. Many

* *Apocalypse.* Sens interne. Étude exégétique. By (Rev.) Charles Byse. Lausanne: l'Agence des Publications, Jumelles, 6. 1920. 210 pp. Paper. 4 francs.

of the contents of "The Apocalypse Revealed" presented themselves quite at once for elimination. To be dropped away, of course, was the translation of each chapter of Revelation with which Swedenborg heads his own chapter of explanation. The general summaries of spiritual meaning could be let go, too, with which Swedenborg introduces his detailed explanation. The numerous Scripture passages cited to bear out interpretations could be reduced to a few, and the most significant. In all this there was no sacrifice of the substance of the interpretation, and much was accomplished towards a brief reproduction. Demonstration of the interpretation could be kept of the briefest. Any reader of "The Apocalypse Revealed" knows that it is the demonstration of the spiritual sense which takes up the bulk of the space in that work, not the statement of the meaning. Mr. Byse lifts the interpretation free, and re-states it in clear and attractive language. (He has remarked in his introduction on the unattractiveness of the style of the Theological Works, especially to the French reader.) Over and above the lucid reproduction of the interpretation of Revelation, Mr. Byse adds occasional varied comment of his own, facts about the cities of the seven churches, reflections on the force of the interpretation.

The book opens with Swedenborg's preface, cut a little. An introduction describes Mr. Byse's purpose. He sketches his unsatisfied study of other explanations of the Book of Revelation. For good measure he notes the conditions in the French-speaking New Church, such as they were when he began (1914) the lectures "au Groupe Swedenborg" which have gone to make up the book, and such as they came to be, hopeful, lively. A text of the Book of Revelation is given a verse or so at a time, based on Swedenborg's translation ("fort exacte") and on critical texts, with some readings of Mr. Byse's own. Divisions are not only into chapters but by headings which keep the general subject of the text before one—Prolog, Ephesus, Second Seal, the New Jerusalem. There are occasional summaries of interpretation, as of the meanings of the seven churches (p. 48). Mr. Byse writes with an infectious enthusiasm throughout. In a conclusion he says:

> At the close of this work, which I would not have undertaken did not the spiritual sense exist, I am filled with admiration for this method. . . . The Apocalypse is assuredly the most difficult book in the whole Bible; yet with Swedenborg's interpretation it ought to be comparatively easy to understand.

In his introduction he wrote:

> Certainly no exegesis of the Apocalypse can vie with this in erudition, in logic, in penetration, in knowledge of the Scriptures and of philosophy, in power of reasoning and in geniality.

He thinks highly of the method of "spiritual interpretation" for other reasons. It renders this mysterious book brimful of meaning, portentous and auspicious, for Christendom to-day. But it also makes the Book of Revelation a final enforcement in the Bible, and a powerful one, of pure monotheism. The book stands revealed as the clearest possible presentation of a Trinity which does not detract from the Divine Unity, and as an exhibition of the mischief done in Christian thought by the traditional tritheistic conception of the Trinity. Spiritually interpreted the book also mounts to its rightful place in the New Testament. In the arraignment of traditional teaching the spiritual interpretation favors neither Protestantism nor Catholicism. It is an interpretation which is borne out by the history of Christian thought, and of the Christian Church, and the present conditions of Christendom.

There seems to be something to do with other efforts to interpret Revelation, especially in its meaning for John and his day, besides giving these up, as Mr. Byse does. To his own work the exceptions one would think of taking are slight. We noted as exceptionable the statement that all the partial descriptions of the Lord in chapters 2 and 3 come out of the first comprehensive description in chapter 1 (p. 28), the retention in a popular work of such a term as "divine natural" in all its technicality (p. 26), the inexact interpretation of "white clouds" to mean the spiritual sense (p. 23), the guess that Swedenborg dropped "The Apocalypse Explained" because it was too detailed and too spiritual for most of his readers (p. 11), the seeming inclusion among the symbols of the Book of Revelation of the tree of knowledge (p. 9), and

the unfortunate position, as if it were Swedenborg's, on the so-called uninspired books of the New Testament, that they are mixtures of truth and falsity (p. 206), where what he asserts is the absence of a spiritual sense from them.

Could this work be done into English, perhaps with a little adaptation at times, it would make a useful book here.

Wm. F. Wunsch.

"THE STORY OF MY LIFE"

Almost simultaneously with the appearance of "Sketches of the New-Church in America" and "The Life of Chauncey Giles" in this country, there was published in England a little book with the title "The Story of My Life." All these publications are practically stories of the life work of three much loved, honored and useful ministers of the New Church: the first, that of the Rev. Abiel Silver, by his daughter Miss Ednah C. Silver; the second, that of the Rev. Chauncey Giles, by one of his daughters, Mrs. James Richard Carter; and the third, a very short but interesting autobiography, that of the Rev. R. R. Rodgers, the pastor of the Birmingham (England) Society for forty-two years. This worthy clergyman visited America in 1882, covered a good part of the continent, was heard in many pulpits, and was urged by many societies to become their minister.

In my childhood I knew and honored Judge Silver (as we used to call him), because my dear old father thought so much of him; in later life I not only honored but loved Rev. Chauncey Giles, because of the great privilege of intimate association with him. I am afraid that neither of the books about these leaders of the New Church in America will be read and pondered as much as they should be, because nearly all of those who most loved the subjects of these biographies, who best knew of their great abilities and devoted and successful work, have also passed on. However that may be, on the suggestion

The Story of My Life. By the Rev. Robt. R. Rodgers. Leeds, England: Inmans Limited. 121 pp., 12 mo. Price $1.50.

of one of our American editors that I should undertake a review of Mr. Rodgers' book, I felt disposed to do so in order to urge that everybody should read it, being only deterred by the fear that I might be prevented from doing justice to it.

Now, when I urge all to read Mr. Rodgers' book, I feel sure that every person who knows me will realize that there must be some compelling reasons that cause me to do so. Some natural reasons may well be stated first. The book is very short — only 121 pages. It is sold at bare cost, for neither Mr. Rodgers nor those who have assisted him in bringing it out desire any other benefit than that which they hope will accrue to others from reading it. It is wonderfully interesting and instructive. It is full of bright stories and anecdotes, not long drawn out, but very brief, and always with sharp, instructive, and amusing points. It is chock-full of good and innocent fun; and those to whom fun is as necessary as it is to me, will derive much joy from it. Other more serious reasons are that lovers of good terse English will enjoy it, for Mr. Rodgers style convincingly proves that he most carefully heeded and profited by the instruction of the Professor of English Literature whom he so gratefully speaks of on page 34. Those who are interested in sound argument, concisely put, will also enjoy it. Other classes of readers who will be helped are those who think that they have been brought to the point of not liking public worship because of "too much pious observance in their early years," and those who think that, by reason of their state or profession, "it is not as necessary for them to attend church as it is for men in business or the ordinary run of people engaged in coarse labor," as one man told Mr. Rodgers. Those who, when asked why they do not attend church, sometimes answer "I have been to a better place," will find some things worth considering; and those who are interested in Sunday schools, and have thought about the duties of parents in the training of their children, will be rewarded by a number of useful hints.

Mr. Rodgers was born and brought up in what would be considered a very dull and uninteresting country place; and yet he tells us that "as a child I never suffered one single dull

moment." It will be very helpful to all to learn how that happy state was brought about. Mr. Rodgers is now in the eighties, and has lost the earthly companionship of his beloved wife, reunion with whom he is joyfully anticipating. After being pastor of the Birmingham Society for forty-two years, during which he had many break-downs, he suddenly lost his voice, and had to give up preaching altogether; and yet he assures us that he is never lonely, probably because (as he says) all his time is filled with many useful and pleasant duties. When he tells us that Mr. Fowler, the phrenologist, informed him that the largest organ in his head was that of hope, and the next one that of mirthfulness, and assures us that with these as constant companions he had no fears or misgivings about the future, he helps all who are bereaved and lonely by showing how this heavenly state was brought about.

Mr. Rodgers was reared in what we call the Old Church, being first a Methodist and then a Baptist. As a youth he always looked forward to becoming a minister. While still a member of the Baptist Church, wanting to know what he was fitted for, he asked Mr. Fowler, the phrenologist, "Shall I do for a minister of religion?" Mr. Fowler's instant reply was, "Not in the Old Church." It will be very interesting to note the reasons Mr. Fowler assigned for his opinion, and what Mr. Rodgers says further on this subject.

The thing that particularly interested me was what he says about "The Divine Love and Wisdom," which was the first book put into his hands to read, and of which he writes "I found it a revelation beyond my wildest hope. I never read a novel with so much ease or enjoyment." His intense desire to get the truth must have opened his natural mind to influx from heaven, or he could not have said this. He bought two of the books, and sent them to his brothers, who soon returned them saying "that they could make neither top nor tail out of it." This led him to the conclusion "that New-Churchmen cannot be made. If at all, they must be seekers of the truth, want it, give anything for it, and never rest till they get it." He did not then know that Swedenborg had told us that the Divine Truth he was revealing to us could not be understood by the

great majority of readers, and would only be seen by the *Quaerenti,* or the earnest seeker for truth. Another thing that amused me very much (because I too have had something to say on the subject) was what he writes about Archdeacon Colley. That gentleman wore a strictly clerical garb, but admitted that he could not write sermons, and wanted Mr. Rodgers to write for him, promising to pay for the same, which he never did; but because he was good-natured and so helpless, Mr. Rodgers continued to lend him sermons to within a few months of his death. I have not said as much and as harsh things about this clerical garb as Mr. Rodgers does; but I have frequently insisted that it is much more important that a clergyman should be mentally and spiritually equipped, than that his collar should be buttoned behind rather than before, and that his vest should come up to his chin. The thing that I am most fully in accord with is what he tells us on page 25. His old Baptist pastor had said to him: "I have no doubt that in a little time you will see the errors of the Swedenborgians, and that you will come back to us." It fills me with joy that this old English minister, commenting on that in his 83rd year, testifies "I have never seen the errors I was to discover, and what is more, I know that they are not there to detect." I hope that many ministers will read this book, and learning why he thus testifies, may be induced to bear like testimony.

There are very many more things that I would like to call attention to, especially his stories and the very obvious and instructive lessons drawn from them, but I must conclude by calling attention to his attitude towards those of the so-called Old Church (see pp. 61-2), so different in spirit and results from the course mistakenly taken by many, and for which he gives his authority in "Arcana Coelestia," n. 1799.

Wm. McGeorge, Jr.

"THE PROPHECIES OF DANIEL."*

Mr. Kip's thesis is an attempt to forecast the future state of the Christian Church from a symbolic application of the Book of Daniel, which is history in the form of prophecy and applicable to the last times of the Church, as is evident from the prediction in Matthew (xxiv, 15). "Self-intelligent rationalism" is to rule in the Church, until recognition of a desperate need calls in the "perceptive element of the true Church" to relieve the devastation produced by the falsification of truth.

The rejection of the Supreme Divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ and the denial of the inspiration of the Word of God, seen in the rise of "Modernism" in the Roman Catholic Church, and, in the Protestant Church, through the publication of such books as *"The New Theology,"* by R. J. Campbell, and *"The New Orthodoxy,"* by E. S. Ames, are cited and accepted as signs of the times and prognostication of the state into which the Christian Church is now entering. "As the Semitic kings of Babylon spoken of in Daniel seem to represent especially the Roman Catholic Church, so Darius the Mede and his kingdom seem to represent especially the Protestant Church—both in the death grasp of the consummating Babylon of self-exaltation and self-intelligence" (p. 115).

"The definite acceptance of the New Church as a Divine revelation is represented by King Hezekiah, and the importance of his period in the future evolution of the New Church is perhaps the reason why a lengthy description of some of the events of his reign is inserted in Isaiah from the book of Kings" (p. 228).

According to this view the Church, under the Divine guidance, will retrace, step by step, the path of its downfall, wiping out its past mistakes. Similar psychical states will recur, but this time the evil must be conquered. "Christians of the Ammon and the Edom type, who persist in clinging to the mere literal sense of the Bible and to external ritualism, and who think that they have only to lead a good life according

---

* *The Prophecies of Daniel.* By A. L. Kip. New York: The Knickerbocker Press. 1919. 240 pp., 12mo. $1.50.

to their own ideas of what is good and that they need no doctrinal instruction, will be left behind in the march of Christian progress" (p. 218). Only those who can examine the doctrines of faith rationally will come into the New Church; but such, like Daniel, are liable to become captive to Babylon. These seem to be permissible and valuable suggestions; but the ringing of the changes on the general theme does not add much that is essentially new.

Allusion to previous works by this author wherein are numerous fanciful suggestions, do not add to the stability of this one. A fancy which imagines that "the several western affluents of the river Humber are the close study of a subject in order to gather numerous authentic facts about it; and its southern affluent, the Trent, is the reflective search for some general law or method which will cover all these facts, and which will serve as a nucleus for judging similar phenomena; while the river Thames is the judging of facts in accordance with established laws and methods," etc. (Kip's "Psychology of the Nations," p. 87-88), seems to indicate that Pegasus needs the bridle. In spite of the display of such erudition, we refuse to be overawed by it and demand reasons for the assertions. In the work under review the four beasts (Dan. vii, 3-8) are interpreted as evils in the life of four nations allied in the war upon Germanic dragonism, possibly with a certain plausibility; but we should like to know why (p. 68) "the exact location of the plain of Dura" (mentioned in Daniel, iii, 1) must be known before an explanation of the spiritual sense can be attempted. The author appears to think that all that is necessary in order to reduce the spiritual sense of the Word and to read its prophecies, is to replace a few of the leading images of the letter by spiritual symbols, defined once for all in as many passages from Swedenborg's writings, and the true meaning will come out automatically, like answers to problems given by a computing machine. The result, as it seems to us (apart from a few wise generalizations, such as those already cited), is a wooden interpretation, lacking vitality, vague, evanescent, speculative, with but little immediate relevancy to the problems of life. FRANK W. VERY.

A BRIEF OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY

Dr. Mercer presents to us a small book,* one we might perhaps call a manual, which in its brief one hundred sixty-six pages places the Old Testament Story as a whole before the reader. The book is an interesting and readable product of scholarship and painstaking, skilled endeavor. The plan of the book challenges the attention of the New-Church reader; for Dr. Mercer personifies Israel, and, after an opening chapter on "The Rock Whence They Were Hewn," divides the history of Israel into the periods of a human life, such as Infancy, Childhood, Youth and on to Ripened Maturity. So he teaches the history of Israel as the history of the growth and development of an individual man from a period before birth to ripe, old age. Our Sunday-school work so often leaves the pupil with fragmentary information in the form of a half memory of disconnected, unrelated Bible stories and events, that it is not safe to ask a Sunday school a simple question of fact in elementary Bible history. Because of this lack of even an elementary view of the Bible as a whole in our Sunday schools, this effort of Dr. Mercer's, to describe the life and growth of Israel from the origin of their ancestors in the deserts of Arabia some thirty-five hundred years before Christ, to the coming of the "Jewish Messiah," is worthy of the attention of our Sunday-school teachers and superintendents.

The author is skillful in selecting from the wealth of Biblical detail, telling points of interest; but as one reads his comments one's heart cries out for the New-Church teaching on these crucial facts of Bible history. For instance, you will find here the dictum, now so widely accepted in regard to the stories of the first chapters of Genesis, that "they show projections of later thought into earlier history." Again, the Egyptians turned back, not (as the Bible says) drowned in the Red Sea, but in discouragement. The author sees the Bible as a book full of religious exaggeration induced by zeal for the glory of

*_The Life and Growth of Israel;_ a brief Old Testament history. By Samuel A. B. Mercer, PhD., D.D. 186 pp., 16 mo. Milwaukee, Wis.: Morehouse Publishing Co. 1921. $1.75.

Jehovah on the part of Israel, rather than as an accurate narrative. Not only here but in many other places, he explains away each miracle; as when he says of the giving of the Ten Commandments:

> On the top of Sinai, at a time when all nature, perhaps an earthquake accompanied by volcanic action, conspired to solemnize the event, Moses was "caught up in spirit" into the very presence of God. . . . There in the presence of God he became deeply conscious of the fact that he was but an instrument in God's hands. The best that he had ever done was God's work; these laws which he had codified were given through him to his people by God Himself. And as they stood there—the laws —engraved upon two tablets of stone, Moses beheld in them the work of the very finger of God. It was Jehovah who had inscribed these stones, for all things came from Him.

The Bible says, "And God spake all these words;" our author feels it necessary to change that to, "And Moses imagined that God spake all these words." So, too, the account of the building of the Tabernacle is due to an historical idealization. As to the crossing of the Jordan, "Later tradition and imagination were busy in supplying details which history has failed to preserve." Again, "Jericho was taken, and most likely by stratagem; but it took the imagination of a much later age to represent its capture in the way familiar to most readers of the Bible." So on through the book we are asked to accept an account that not only explains away much of what the Bible plainly teaches, thus taking away the face value of Sacred Scripture, but also substitutes the interpretation of modern scholarship in place of what the Bible really means. From this point of view the book is a drop in the flood of water that the serpent is casting out his mouth to carry away the woman clothed with the sun, whose glorious man-child is to rule all nations. It is difficult for one who reads the Word of God in the light of heavenly doctrine given from the same source that gave the Word, to value the results of Bible study wherein there is not the faintest glimmer of this revelation. Yet we ought to recognize the ability, the industry, the zeal, the training which the author of this book displays. Then, too, in fairness we need to see the purpose of this book, which is, to arouse interest in, and turn its readers to the Bible stories as human documents telling of the development

or evolution of the idea of God, culminating in Jesus the Christ.

The teacher of the Bible today has a hard task to face. He who relies upon the faith of his orthodox fathers is made to appear absurd. Common sense rebels against the old ideas of Biblical exegesis. An interpretation of God's Word that science proves absurd is now unacceptable. It is true that a great many Old-Church people are undisturbed in traditional orthodoxy, and hold their faith blindly; but to teach the old, conventional ideas of theology to the young people of the Protestant Church in the face of the study and investigation of God's Word that is being made today, is to put one's self in an impossible and untenable position.

Swedenborg has entered this field of Bible study, and has won for us the battle there. He has given the New-Church teacher of doctrine entirely new ground to stand on. He makes it possible for the New-Church teacher to appeal to the rationality of his pupil, and yet leave unchanged the idea that "God spake all these words." The teacher gives them the Bible statement at its face value as the foundation on which he rears his teaching. He can say: "Let us take advantage of all the facts that the learned men of the world can discover about this Bible of ours. There is nothing of truth that can do us anything but good. Let us have all the knowledge we can gather. Then, when it comes to drawing conclusions from those facts, we will do that for ourselves, guided by the light of heaven that shines forth upon men now from the Word of God." On this ground, with the help of the teachings of the Lord Himself, the New-Church educator can teach a religion founded on rational doctrine drawn from and confirmed by the Word of God. He need not fear that his work will suffer in comparison with the instruction of others.

RUSSELL EATON.

Storage